THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER;

OR,

UNITARIAN

MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER;

OR,

UNITARIAN

MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, VOL. VII.

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1851.

LONDON:

EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 2, ESSEX STREET, STRAND.

1851.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. LXXIII.] JANUARY, 1851. [Vol. VII.

17 Ja 03 Elizabeth M Howe 3.

THE NO-POPERY AGITATION.*

The Church is again in danger. The cry of Wolf! has been once more raised by the timid shepherds of her spiritual flock. Not many weeks ago, and all was quiet. Members of Parliament were busy on moors, in copses and stubble-fields; barristers were taking their hasty trip up the Rhine and into Switzerland; stay-at-home Englishmen were fain to look to Prussia and Austria for exciting news; and foreign correspondence crowded the long columns of the Times. And then suddenly, like a West-Indian hurricane, there was a roar of many words throughout the land. One might have supposed that the French bayonets which had carried the Pope from Naples to Rome, had escorted him on to Westminster. The thunders of the daily press are fulminated against the Tiara. The Prime Minister is straightway so seized with Protestant zeal, as to become a newspaper correspondent, and stigmatize the worship of one-third of her Majesty's subjects as the "mummeries of superstition." But Whiggism, though predominant, is not the only party in the State, nor is allowed to monopolize the new political capital. D'Israeli, on behalf of the Conservatives, contributes sarcasm, and Roebuck, for the Radicals, sense, to the now seething caldron. Catholics appeal, Protestants make doughty resolves. There are lectures, and disputations, and pamphlets, and newspaper letters innumerable. The Pope is burnt in effigy in the streets of our great cities, and the police stand by in approving silence. Nor is violence wanting. Clerical hands are laid upon Mr. Miall, and policemen's heads are broken by Irish navigators at Birkenhead. Bishops are kept in a perfect fury of correspondence with their divers dearly-beloved brethren. Sheriffs and Archdeacons are persecuted with innumerable requisitions; and pulpits echo with the double war-cry of Papal Aggression and Religious Liberty!

And a stirring cry this last doubtless is to the heart of English Protestant Nonconformity. It recals the time when it was but feebly heard from the thin ranks who fought and won, inch by inch, the long battle of Emancipation. But there are many circumstances of the present agitation which are calculated to excite a just suspicion. It is suspicious that the existence of the Establishment and the principles of Religious Liberty are in alleged peril at the same moment. It is

* An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy. By Cardinal Wiseman.

Supremacy of the Crown and the Liberties of the British People vindicated from Romish Usurpations, in a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Wiseman; being a Reply to his Address, &c. By the Rev. J. W. Worthington, D.D.

3013

suspicious that the very persons who have always most strenuously and most unscrupulously opposed Nonconformist principles, should now be the loudest to implore Nonconformist aid. It is suspicious that a rich and all-powerful Establishment should raise the cry against the Church of the ignorant and the poor. The Presbyterian who is old enough to remember 1829, may well pause before he ranges himself by the side of Cumming and M'Neile.

For ourselves, after much attention devoted to the matter, we profess our inability to discover why the present uproar should not have been raised at any period since the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act as well as now. Daily have we perused the Times, from first advertisement to printer's name, and Bishops' charges, parochial meetings and Protestant correspondence, have been a veritable "weariness of the flesh." Our table is now covered with pamphlets of every size and colour,—the Bishop of London's "Charge" advancing in solemn array against Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal,—D'Israeli and Punch skirmishing against the Premier and the Papal Bull. Dr. Newman's sermon supplies eloquence, and a dozen Unitarian sermons honest logic and kindly good sense, to the heap. But at least half the fighting is wide of the point destined to be lost and won. Dr. Cumming perseveringly quotes Liguori to shew that the Romish Church authorizes lying, and then contrives to get into so disreputable a controversy touching the Cardinal's oath, that the Times refuses to admit his letters. Lord Fielding, the Bishop of St. Asaph and the church at Partasa, supply an agreeable episode. The massacre of St. Bartholomew is raked up for the sake of maintaining kindly feeling; and the celebrated "Ugonnotorum Strages" medal re-issued, at the low price of sixpence, that it may be within the means of every pious Protestant. And the sum-total of the impression which we have gained from the events of the last month is, that the Pope has been arrogant, yet singularly injudicious, the English Premier in want of an election cry, the Evangelical clergy rabid, the Tractarians cowardly, and the orthodox Dissenters, for the most part, forgetful of their boasted principles. Yet, at the same time, among the Protestant laity of England a feeling, whether ill or well grounded, has been awakened, which is ample security against any really formidable Papal aggression.

The facts of the case are soon told. The Church government of the Catholics in England has hitherto been anomalous. They have been ruled by Vicars Apostolic, who, being Bishops only in partibus, were the immediate delegates of the Pope, from whom no appeal lay save to him. At the request of these Vicars and of English Catholics in general, Pius IX., by a Bull "given at St. Peter's at Rome, under the seal of the Fisherman, the 24th of September, 1850," constituted England "one single ecclesiastical province, with an Archbishop and twelve Suffragans." The titles of these sees are all different from those of the Anglican Bishops, and so far the letter of the law is respected. Dr. Wiseman, heretofore Vicar Apostolic and Bishop of Melipotamus, is by a subsequent act created Cardinal Priest of St. Pudentiana and Archbishop of Westminster. And hence the first count of the indictment—namely, that the appointment of Bishops with territorial designations is an offence against the Queen's Supremacy. But the manner of the act has made the act itself doubly offensive. The Bull knows

of but one "Church of England," one hierarchy. The Reformation is the "Anglican schism of the sixteenth century." Cardinal Wiseman addresses his first Pastoral Letter to "the Clergy, Secular and Regular, and the Faithful of the Archdiocese of Westminster and the Diocese of Southwark." In the same document he announces his intention of governing and continuing "to govern the counties of Middlesex, Hertford and Essex, as Ordinary thereof, and those of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Berkshire and Hampshire, with the islands annexed, as Administrator with ordinary jurisdiction." And a Roman Catholic Prelate, in a document, to which we have not now the opportunity of referring, has claimed, consistently enough with the principles of his Church, spiritual authority over all the baptized persons in his diocese. The Pope ignores the Christianity of England, and chooses to treat it as a heathen country now reconciled to his sway. Hinc illæ lacrymæ.

Now there is no doubt that the storm of feeling has been raised by this insult, while, nevertheless, the argumentative passage of arms has taken place touching the legal offence. And here we think the Catholic case is complete. They allege that the position which they at present occupy is only the legal development of that assured to them by the Act of Emancipation. They have always denied the Royal Supremacy. The effect of that Act was to take away certain civil disabilities attendant upon the denial. They have always acknowledged the Supremacy of the Pope, and therefore carefully distinguished between the things of Cæsar and the things of God. There is no law to forbid the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops in England, but only one which prohibits their taking their designations from sees at present occupied by the English Church. That law has been literally adhered to. The Protestant agitators affirm that Romish casuistry has dictated this adoption of the letter of a law, which ought to have been interpreted according to its spirit. The Catholics triumphantly reply that legal interpretation is in its essence literal. If, then, the present "aggression" be an offence against the law, it is no new one, but necessarily consequent on the toleration of Catholics at all.

But the outworks of the Catholic case are no less strong than its legal citadel. The Queen's Supremacy extends over Ireland and the colonies, yet there Roman Catholic Bishops have been appointed without exciting any storm of indignation. The Irish Bishops, Catholic and Protestant, preside over the same sees. Archbishops Whately and Murray peaceably occupy the same diocese of Dublin. Within a very few years the Pope has created a new Bishopric of Galway. More, the English Government have gone so far as to concede to Irish Roman Catholic Prelates the titles of Most Reverend and Right Reverend, and to give them precedence over the temporal peers of the country. Who could have supposed that the creation of a less ambitious hierarchy in England would have been called insolent, insidious, illegal? Again, in 1845, the now zealous Premier—not then seduced from the "mummeries of superstition" at St. Barnabas by the superior attraction of Crown Court—said in his place in Parliament, "He believed that they might *repeal* those disallowing clauses which prevented a Roman Catholic Bishop assuming a title held by a Bishop of the Established Church. He could not conceive any good ground for the continuance of this restriction." In 1846, he repeated the declaration: "As to

preventing persons assuming particular titles, nothing could be more absurd and puerile than to keep up such a distinction." A copy of the Papal Brief was shewn, two years ago, to Lord Minto, when on his mysterious Italian tour. The whole scheme was long ago known to the Government, who neither protested nor forbade. And as to the substitution of Bishop for Vicars Apostolic, the change is one likely to insure an increase of English feeling in the Roman Catholic hierarchy. A Vicar Apostolic is the immediate delegate of the Italian Priest whose domination is so dreaded by Protestant zealots, owing immediate obedience to him, and removable at his pleasure. The Bishops are to a great extent independent of the Pope,—once appointed, cannot be displaced,—and, Englishmen by birth, are likely to remain so in feelings, habits and allegiance. And, as for the territorial designations, there were Vicars Apostolic of York, Lancaster and London: two of them, therefore, competitors with English Bishops in their own sees.

At the same time it cannot be denied that the present controversy is not only one of law and toleration, but of feeling. We must admit that there is more in it than at first meets the eye. There are reasons why the Papal movement should have been made just at this moment. Our readers do not need to be reminded of the prevalence in the Establishment of opinions called Tractarian, nor to be instructed as to their nature. Their tendency has been sufficiently exemplified by the practice and ceremonies lately introduced into the services of the Church, and the numerous conversions made to Catholicism. Nevertheless, a bold move on the part of the Pope was necessary to secure certain waverers, who yet halted on the brink of Anglicanism, trying to persuade themselves of the essential identity of the two Churches, and thus cleansing their consciences of the guilt of schism. Rome has therefore spoken, and the English Reformation is now "the schism of the 16th century." Whether or not Pius IX. was misled as to the extent of open or secret Romanism in the country, or expected that at a word the State of England would hasten to be reconciled with the Holy See, we know not. Converts are not multiplied as yet, and even the Tractarian clergy seem disposed to defend the validity of their own orders.

Notwithstanding the noisy invectives against Catholic doctrine and practice, which for many years past have formed a large element in so-called Evangelical preaching, the Church of England, by her adherence to the clumsy fiction of Apostolical Succession, has always been compelled to acknowledge more or less the claims of the Church of Rome. For there is the fountain whence her own orders are derived, and her utmost claim has been to a co-ordinate station in the great Christian community. A Roman Catholic priest needs no re-ordination to exercise ecclesiastical functions in England: the Archbishop of Canterbury himself is a layman in the eyes of the Pope. And hence may be explained the position taken up in the controversy by the Bishop of Oxford and his Tractarian followers. The Bishop of Rome has ignored them. They put forth equal claims with himself. Though dishonestly eating the bread of Protestantism, they had chosen to forget Protestant principles. They had set up the small infallibility of Oxford against the great infallibility of Rome. And lo! to their infinite disgust, Rome declines to fraternize, and claims their allegiance as peremptorily as

that of the lowest Evangelical—confounds them with Calvinist and Socinian in the one sweeping charge of schism.

The Bishop of Exeter, another Prelate who has been long encouraging Romish principles and practices in the Church, yet whose zeal is now startled into protest, chooses, with Rev. G. A. Denison and Archdeacon Wilberforce, the present opportunity for taking up a middle position between Canterbury and Rome—in short, for becoming a Dissenter. He denies equally the Supremacy of the Queen and the Pope. He acknowledges, like every Dissenter, Christ to be the sole Head of his Church. On these grounds he refuses to sign the protest transmitted to her Majesty by the Episcopal Bench, and forwards a private memorial of his own. Nevertheless, as that memorial is a denial of Royal privilege and an unwarrantable assertion of private right, Sir George Grey decided, properly enough, that the Queen could not receive it. So then, as far as the Bishop of Exeter and his party are concerned, the quarrel is reduced simply to a squabble between rival hierarchies. If to deny the Royal Supremacy be an offence against the law, they offend equally. And the Dissenter, who acknowledges neither civil nor hierarchical supremacy in matters of conscience, may leave them, with a smile, to settle it as they please. The only Protestant feeling which we are inclined to respect is that which has been displayed by the Evangelical Church and the orthodox Dissenters. We believe that they are ignorant of the true nature of the position for which they contend; that in many cases they have fought with the unholiest weapons of controversy; that they have been struck with a most unreasonable panic; but, nevertheless, that the struggle is, on their side, for the vital principles of religion which they dearly prize, less than for an insult to a hierarchy or the pretensions of a Church.

There is, however, a question which may be very advantageously put to those persons who feel and complain of the insult,—What practical end do you propose to yourselves in this agitation? It is, in fact, a remarkable characteristic of the resolutions, addresses and protests which the present occasion has called forth, that they none of them even hint at the course which their proposers wish to be adopted. In some of the answers which her Majesty is about to give to deputations from the Universities and other public bodies, the Government may afford some indication of its intention; but such intention will have the merit of being perfectly spontaneous. The Premier has committed himself by his unfortunate letter; had he held his peace, he might have thrown the responsibility of proposing any legislative measure on her Majesty's opposition. And now what is to be done? An insult offered by any foreign power to the Queen of England, if not explained away by the artifices of diplomacy, is usually revenged by fleets and armies. We do not choose to accredit an ambassador to the Papal Court, and the idea of declaring war against the Pope would be too absurd for all but Lord Winchelsea. But a law may be passed to prohibit the assumption of these offensive titles. And what then? No law can touch the spiritual power of the Pope or his Cardinal in England. The indictment against it can be brought only in foro conscientiæ. The law may not recognize any such Prelate as the Bishop of Birmingham; may threaten Dr. Ullathorne with pains and penalties if he retain the title; but cannot take away from him one tittle of influence over the Catholics in the

diocese assigned him by the Pope. The rival diocesan, the Bishop of Worcester, is in a very different position. He has a large income, a splendid residence, extensive patronage, and a seat in the House of Lords. A Dissenting majority in Parliament might have a very practical effect on these episcopal rights and privileges; but under any reforming or persecuting enactments, the rival Bishops would continue to claim undivided spiritual jurisdiction over the diocese, and Mr. Kentish and Mr. Dawson equally to ignore the claim. In brief, if an offence has been committed against the law, let the alleged offenders be brought into the ordinary courts, though not before the magistrate who has already taken it upon him to prejudge the question: if the result be an acquittal, let us not tarnish Catholic Emancipation by an ex-post-facto measure of persecution.

The point now in dispute is, however, far from being a new one. It is as old as Stephen Langton even in England; in Germany it dates back to Gregory VII. and Henry VI. Even Catholic princes have always claimed the right of investing the Bishops of their kingdoms with at least their temporalities. Disputes with Rome have been hot and long, but have always ended in a Concordat. And this is, in fact, the only practical solution of the question. It would be an undoubted hardship if the Roman Catholic Church in England were to be prohibited a government after their own fashion. We have already shewn that the essence of such government—namely, the spiritual power of their ecclesiastical dignitaries—cannot be touched by legal enactment; yet, at the same time, the existence of a body of Prelates, possessing no little power, direct and indirect, in the country, yet owning some species of allegiance and looking for promotion to a foreign potent, must in many cases be an anomaly most inconvenient to the Legislature. Nor is an instance to point the moral wanting. It seems probable that the Pope and his Synod of Thurles will, for a time at least, get the better of the Queen and her Irish Colleges. The remedy is not difficult to be found, though at the same time unpalatable enough to Protestant zealots. Let the English Government, like that of Prussia, look upon the Popedom and Roman Catholicism as undoubted facts, necessary to be taken into account in legislation; and let them, by the establishment of diplomatic relations with Rome, secure the appointment of Prelates, Englishmen in birth, education and feeling.

Whatever, then, may be the legislative result of the present agitation, the Catholic hierarchy is, in our view, a thing that no law can reach. A territorial hierarchy can never exist—a pretended territorial hierarchy may be forbidden. But in conceding the right of Catholics as such to inhabit the same island, the Protestant majority has of necessity given them also the right of self-government in their own manner. But, nevertheless, a deeper question than any yet agitated underlies this whole strife,—one which all Protestant governments have already been called upon to answer practically, though perhaps unconsciously,—Can Catholics be good citizens of a Protestant state? Thousands would at the present moment unhesitatingly answer in the negative. Like the Dissenters, they deny the Royal Supremacy; unlike the Dissenters, they acknowledge Supremacy of a foreign Prince. Allegiance is indivisible; for if the attempt be made, the result is but a perpetual difficulty to distinguish between the things of Cæsar and of God. And whenever

the contest arises, the priest, acting upon both the conscience and the interest of the votary, is sure to win the victory, be his ends ever so unholy or so unjust. And the real question is not one of the new hierarchy, nor of this year at all, but of the whole religious policy of our country,—Is it safe, on grounds purely political, to tolerate Catholicism? The true answer to this question is, that English law takes no cognizance of religious principles, but only of overt acts.

We will not argue over again a point which has been again and again enforced in these pages by those who have themselves fought the hard battle of Toleration. We merely repeat that, to secure the perfect enjoyment of religious liberty and equality to every individual, the State ought to be purely a civil corporation, which ignores altogether the faith and opinions of the persons whom it governs and represents. There are, undoubtedly, religious principles which logically lead to overt acts detrimental to the well-being of the State. Such was the Anabaptism of John of Leyden. Yet the State has no right to argue from the principles to the acts, and so prevent the latter by punishing the former. It would indeed be hard to punish men for the logical consequences even of their philosophical faith, and sometimes not a little difficult to find out what those consequences were. A Church Establishment is, logically considered, inconsistent with toleration; but the anomaly is better than the consistency, and may be the chaos out of which a higher order will spring.

If the theory of the Roman Catholic Church were fully exemplified in its practice, we would willingly admit that Roman Catholics would be dangerous citizens. But the law takes cognizance only of the practice; and no religious body, least of all the Church of England, has a right to visit the sins of ultra-montane clergy upon the heads of English Catholic laymen. We are willing to record our individual opinion that Roman Catholicism is a grossly corrupt form of Christianity; that its doctrines are untrue, its ceremonies superstitious, its ethics immoral, its polity opposed to the best interests of humanity. We are not disposed to forget the Spanish Inquisition or the massacre of St. Bartholomew. We believe that the Church of Rome is, by theory and practice, a persecuting Church; that, once supreme in England, she would soon forget her present cry of religious liberty. But at the same time we believe that, in the English Catholic layman, the Englishman predominates over the Catholic; that if either allegiance must be given up, he will forsake his Priest sooner than his Queen; that he has been too long emancipated from the despotism of the State to submit himself to absolutism in the Church. The Duke of Norfolk and Lord Beaumont supply evidence of the fact. They deprecate the tone of the Papal Manifesto, and believe "that ultra-montane opinions are totally incompatible with allegiance to their Sovereign and with the Constitution."

We have said that least of all ought members of the Church of England to insist on identifying the theory of the Catholic Church with the practice of her adherents. For to us, who consider the whole question ab extrâ, the Church of England is as much Papal in her spirit as the Church of Rome. In common with every Church which makes salvation dependent upon belief in certain defined doctrines, she lays claim to undivided supremacy over the consciences of men. She merely enforces her claims in a different manner. By the damnatory

clauses of the Athanasian Creed, she attempts to frighten schismatics into her communion: the Church of Rome adopts the more palpable instrument of earthly pains and penalties to compass the same end. And these anti-Protestant claims are expressed haughtily enough by the majority of her clergy and the laity more immediately under their influence. Yet to how small extent do they affect the privileges, civil and religious, of English Dissenters! How far advanced is the State before the Church, with which it is avowedly one! How different is the feeling expressed towards Dissenters by the laity of the Church either from the principles of their creed or the language of the clergy! And thus, in the present crisis, while feeling no sympathy with the loud-tongued complaints and invectives of a clergy Popish in principle and daily practice, we hail with pleasure the manifestation of Protestant feeling among the laity. For while we believe that they have mistaken the occasion for protest,—that, except in so far as they are combatting the insidious Romanism of their own Church, they are fighting with a shadow,—we gladly acknowledge that to their genuine Protestantism we are indebted for the undisturbed possession of our own religious liberties, and look forward without fear to the worst which Rome and Roman principles can do.

As for the insult, Dissenters can afford to pass it by in silence. They have long been used to the same contemptuous treatment. The returns made to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners pass them over, in the same way as the Church of England has been now passed over by Rome. A village within the sphere of our own knowledge, in which an old Presbyterian chapel has lately been rebuilt at an expense of little short of £10,000, was not long since reported by Church authorities as being altogether destitute of accommodation for public worship. It is in no spirit of unseemly triumph that we express a hope, that the Church of England, now called to endure the arrogance she has long inflicted on others, may learn a lesson of Christian brotherhood from the trial. In the mean time, we have sufficient faith in the genuine spirit of Protestantism not to wish to defend it by the fortifications of legal enactment. The truth of God will not be aided by the unholy weapons of human warfare.

C.

VERSE-WRITING.

Verse-writing, notwithstanding all the talk you hear about it, is in almost all cases a totally idle affair; a man was *not* sent into the world to write verses —no! If he finds himself called to speak, let him *speak*, manfully, some "words of truth and soberness;" and, in general, leave the *singing* and verse-making part of it, till the very last extremity, if some inward or outward call drive him irresistibly thither. Nay, in these times, I observe there is less and less attention paid to things in verse; and serious persons everywhere find themselves disposed to hear what a man has to say *the shortest way and the directest*,—that is to say, disencumbered of rhyme. I for my share am well content with *this* tendency of the world.—*Thomas Carlyle's letter of advice to a verse-writing kinsman.*

PROTEST AGAINST UNITARIAN ADVOCACY OF NON-RESISTANCE TO THE POPE'S BULL.

Sir,

I felt obliged to you for the intimation of your willingness to insert in the *Christian Reformer* a paper expressing my cordial sympathy with the national and popular feeling on this momentous occasion; and not the less, because you candidly avowed that my opinions were not your own, and that my article would be preceded by one of which I should not approve. What I have read since the last ten days, obliges me to change the form of my communication to you. I think it most decorous to shew at once that I am aware my sentiments will probably not be those of your readers, and that they are those of an individual who will not attempt to conciliate favour by a gradual insinuation of his opinions, but avow at once that his sympathies are rather with that national instinct which chalks "No Popery" on our pavements and walls, than with the clerical dissertations which end in indifference, if not approbation, of giving to the Pope of Rome concurrent jurisdiction with the Queen of Great Britain in the ecclesiastical demarcation of her dominions.

This I write after the painful perusal in the *Inquirer* of the 7th inst. of an article professing to record "The Part taken by Unitarians in the Anti-Papal Movement." A more candid reporter would have said, "In the resistance to the Papal Movement." This paper reports the opinions of Mr. Harris, of Newcastle; Mr. H. Solly, of Gloucester; Mr. Palmer, at Dudley; Mr. M'Dowall, at Stockton; Mr. W. Biggs, at Leicester, and some lay Unitarians at other places. A letter is referred to by the Rev. E. Higginson; and the solitary exception to these conceding opinions is the opposite declaration of Mr. Montgomery, of Taunton. There are also now lying before me the recent discourses of Mr. Crosskey, of Derby; Mr. Hincks, of Exeter; Mr. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester; Mr. James, of Bristol, but delivered in the London Portland-Street chapel; Mr. Boucher, the successor of Mr. Aspland at the Hackney Gravel-Pit meeting; and Mr. Hamilton Thom, of Liverpool. These discourses have of necessity all that diversity of style which men of such various ability could employ; but they have one common object, to check the national movement elsewhere so active; and though they all profess contempt rather than hatred of the Papal government, yet all are advancing its interests in thus assailing its opponents. I may refer, as occasion offers, to the particular opinions advanced by these debaters in public or preachers, and proceed, as methodically as I can, to state why I altogether dissent from these sentiments.

In the absence of any published expression of an opposite sentiment, and constrained therefore to consider this as the manifestation of the collective judgment of the descendants of the old Presbyterians, the first reflection which was forced upon me, and that of an humiliating character, was the contrast it exhibits to the conduct of their ancestors on the last great trial of public virtue.

When James the Second had conceived the project of restoring the Roman Catholic Church, it was of very great importance to him to

secure, if not the active support, at least the negative aid of neutrality or indifference from the Nonconformists. They were a far more powerful body then than the Dissenters now are. Therefore, when penal acts which affected them in common with the Romanists were by an act of despotism suspended, and religious liberty was the bait offered, had the Nonconformists given their aid to the Court, the whole course of events would have been changed; for in all probability the King for the moment would have triumphed. This act of treason towards the national liberties would, however, have had some apology in the cruel persecutions they had sustained from the Bishops of the Anglican Church in the late reign. But they forgot their wrongs, and, regardless of the ungrateful return which the more sagacious of them probably anticipated, they refused the proffered boon. The plea of religious liberty was disregarded; and when it was afterwards deemed necessary to protect the State by the passing of the Test and Corporation Acts, they again submitted to be brought within their operation, under which they suffered until within a few years. Nobler acts than these were never performed by any religious body. Next to the secession of the Two Thousand Ministers on the passing of the Bartholomew Act, these constitute the glory of Nonconformists. The memory of the Two Thousand is a standing toast at all the convivial meetings of the Dissenters. But where shall we find the disinterested spirit of those heroes? On looking over all the reported speeches and sermons I have referred to, I have found none but considerations of the most sectarian and selfish character. A stray sentiment or expression may have escaped me, but certainly no prominent thought is there founded on the consideration, How will this measure affect the nation or community at large? "In the contest of hierarchy against hierarchy," says Mr. Boucher, "as a religious body *we* are not concerned,"—it never occurring to him or to any of his brother ministers, that we are members of a State as well as a religious body, and that one of the hierarchies is approved of by the undisputed majority of the nation. The readiness of the Unitarian body and of a portion of the orthodox Dissenters to acquiesce in this invasion of national rights by the Pope, exposes them alike to the severest reproach. In the place of the cruel persecutions sustained by their predecessors, the modern Dissenting ministers have endured affronts and insults. They are often denied the character of brother clergymen; now and then, in a remote county, an ultra bigot refuses to read the entire burial service over a Dissenter, or let the body be carried into the church; a Bishop has been known to address a minister as an Esquire; and one egregious fanatic refuses to marry a man who is not confirmed. But these occasional relics of an intolerance that is certainly diminishing, are really more annoying to the liberal members of the Church than they ought to be to the Dissenters. That they are recollected during a national crisis like this, proves, I fear, that as persecution strengthens and improves characters inherently noble, so the relaxation of persecution deteriorates what is ignoble. The emancipation of the Catholics has been met by an attempt to establish Romanism in the most insulting manner; and the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts has been met by the Anti-State-Church Association, in which, however, few Unitarians take part;—the object being the same as far as the destruction of the National Church is

concerned, though, when that has been effected, the profit is to be applied in different ways.

The consequence of this lively recollection of the real or supposed wrongs which we have sustained from the Established Church, is what appears to me a flagrant injustice towards that Church, whenever it is brought into comparison with the Church of Rome. All the enormities of that Church are passed over in silence, and all that is papistical in the Church of England dwelt on exclusively, as if it had no Protestant element also. Hence it is quietly assumed that there is no essential difference between them. Yet the difference lies so on the surface, that I find it hard not to consider the blindness which overlooks it as lying rather in the will than the understanding. Allow me to state wherein this injustice lies. It lies in the wilful disregard of these opposed facts, viz., that the Church of Rome is an establishment of pure despotism, so skilfully framed as to be secure from any other opposition than that of separation. The infallibility which is inherent in the Church is not an inert principle, but may be called into action at any moment, for it has a living organ in its Head, the Pope, whose announcements, as such Head, are also infallible. This, the theoretical perfection of the Church of Rome, constitutes at the same time its malignity. It suffers no contradiction; wherever the Church has spoken, resistance is impossible; private judgment is unknown. When the oppression arising from this state of mental slavery became intolerable, and a successful rebellion ended in the establishment of independent and reformed churches, the separation was justified by an enumeration of supposed false doctrines, corruptions and abominations, with which I have now nothing to do. The only material question is, What in this most important particular is the character of the English Church? Here I observe a uniform inadvertence in all these sermons, &c., to this great fact, that though there are in the Church many Popish elements, these are to a great degree rendered inoperative by the counteracting operation of the Protestant element.

From the Reformation to the present time, there has been an unceasing war within the Church, in which, as the High or Low Church party prevailed, the Popish element, authority, was rigidly or liberally enforced; but at no time could the Protestant element be excluded. For though the 20th Article asserts the authority of the Church in controversies of faith, yet the same Article acknowledges that the Church ought not to decree anything at variance with the Scriptures; hence the right of each individual to inquire and for himself to determine whether or not the Church has done what it ought, is indisputable. This heterogeneous character of the Church of England constitutes its weakness as a Church militant, and is the theme of reproach to all its High-church discontented members, as well as its adversaries in the Church of Rome. But for that very reason it ought to have been treated with forbearance by the *soi-disant* liberals on the present occasion. On the contrary, these its infirmities are adduced as gravamina, instead of being contrasted, as in fairness they ought, with the inflexible and inexorable consistency of the Church of Rome. Whoever has any knowledge of the history of the Church, knows that that history consists mainly of a narrative of the alternate successes of the two parties.

The last great contest which has arisen in our days arises out of the

triumph of the Low-church or Evangelical party, mainly aided by the religious spirit diffused over the country by Methodism. In its turn, however, High-churchism advanced, chiefly by means of the Tracts; and this so aggravated the intestine war between the two parties, that at last it came to an issue in the great Gorham case.

The decision in this case was a great step in favour of free inquiry, and ought to have been recognized as such. A tribunal mainly of lawyers and laymen, anxious to save the Establishment from immediate disruption, came to this conclusion, viz., that on a point of extreme delicacy (the nature and efficacy of the sacraments), though the Church had required subscription from all alike, yet the subscribers might interpret the words subscribed in senses directly opposed to each other; —a decision which involves a renunciation, it should seem, of that authority which is the boast of High-churchmen, and ought to have gained for it some favour from the Nonconformist enemies to subscription, which is thereby rendered, if not ridiculous, at least powerless as a weapon of assault.

The glorification of the priesthood constituting the essence of Popery and being the aim of High-churchism, the connection of the Church and State becomes a most important feature in the inquiry. Here arise the important questions, how far the continuance of the present Church Establishment is or is not a bulwark against the Church of Rome, and also, whether it becomes the liberal Dissenters, and our friends in particular, to act in alliance with that violent Anti-State-Church Association which the spirit of Calvinistic Evangelicism has raised with so great violence against the Church of England?

I cannot go into the question of a Church Establishment further than this, that I trust I am now entitled to assume that the present Anglican Church interferes less with personal liberty than the Church of Rome does wherever it reigns supreme. In that Church, notoriously, the alliance of Church and State means simply the subjugation of the State to the Church. The conflicts that even governments which are called Catholic have never ceased to carry on against the Pope are well known. I have no time to enumerate them. I remark merely, that at no period was the Church of Rome so triumphant as at this moment. The young Emperor of Germany has surrendered to the Pope all those laws protective of the State against the Pope enacted by the reforming Jos. II., and though the liberties of the Gallican Church are not formally renounced, yet the party opposed to them have the ear of Louis Napoleon, and caused the military occupation of Rome to restore the Pope to his authority. In the face of these facts, and with a full knowledge of the character of the Church of Rome, I ask, does it become us to give our aid to the Anti-State-Church Association, without considering the consequences of success? To me it seems that that success would be a deplorable result, by advancing the interests of the priesthood in opposition to the salutary influence of the most enlightened portion of the community. By the State in England is now manifestly understood, not the Crown or the Court, but the body of educated laymen of property and influence. Under the republicanized monarchy of England, the Crown can exercise no power over the Church or in education but under the guidance and through the agency of the intelligent laity; hence the fierce opposition of the High-church party to the

Government scheme of Education. The late contest on the Government scheme was a contest between priestcraft and the liberal tendencies of the age. I do not reproach the High-church party for this. They were fighting for their all; but I do lament the blindness, from hate, which makes the Dissenters the allies of their bitterest enemies.

It is well known that an alliance of the Tory enemies of the Whig Ministry in Parliament with the opposition of the orthodox Dissenters, under the direction of their ministers *(who are* PRIESTS *without being aware of it)*, has more than once defeated the well-intended Educational schemes of the Ministry. Now let us suppose the Anti-State-Church Society to succeed in overturning the Church, what is to become of its revenues? Are they to be given to each parish in relief of the rates? Or are the landlords to have a gift of the tithes? Or are these revenues to be still appropriated to the clergy, and are the clergy in each parish to be elected by universal suffrage? It is sufficient to suggest the ulterior inquiries which must be raised, in order to induce every one of the least power of reflection to shrink from any act which should necessitate a practical answer to these questions. I permit myself one other question: Were the wealth, power and patronage now possessed by the State Church, thus explained, torn from the Church and given as a prey to be fought for by the clergy of the churches Roman and Anglican, Congregational and Methodistic,—the Unitarians having their share in due proportion to their numbers,—what, I ask, would be gained for liberty, forbearance, rationality, and every other social virtue, Pagan or Christian?

There is, however, another consideration which must render all thinking men cautious before they attempted the destruction of the National Church, were it in their power. It cannot have escaped their observation that it is not every one who can with safety be left to the formation of his own creed, and who can stand alone without the aid of a Church. There is a large proportion even of morally excellent persons who would find the task of constructing a creed for themselves oppressively burthensome, and who wish to put themselves voluntarily under the yoke of a Church. They feel "the weight of chance desires." Conscious of their own incapacity to solve the problems which a scholastic theology has framed, and being alarmed by the threat thrown out even more fearfully by the orthodox Protestant Churches than by the Roman Catholic, they seek an asylum in an infallible Church, which is an unquestionable authority. This is the secret of the power of the Church of Rome, and priests of the Anglican Church, envious of this power, have gone as near asserting it for their Church as its position permitted; and unsatisfactory as their asserted authority is, it still suffices for many. Were, however, this Church broken up, a very large proportion of its members would have no other place of refuge than the Roman Catholic Church. The swarm of pious believers longing for a community and home, would be attracted by the tinkling of the Roman bell, and hived in the bosom of the infallible Church. The profit of the destruction of the Anglican Church would go into the treasury of the Romish Church—at least a larger proportion than the destroyers would get for their pains.

Among the instances of a purely selfish or sectarian view of the subject, common to all these gentlemen, is this, that they consider

exclusively the effect on *them* of this Papal assumption. Even Mr. Thom remarks, "We do not feel that Rome is a whit nearer *to us* (the italics are his) than she was before." Now no one fears or cares much for the effect on the educated Nonconformists of the Papal Bull. I feel ashamed of adverting to such an arrant commonplace as this, that Church Establishments are formed, not for those who are qualified or inclined to choose a Church for themselves, but for the mass of uneducated persons, for whom the Established Church is (whether at all times avowed or not) the most important instrument of popular education; and as such it is surely a question easy of solution,—Shall that instrument be placed in the hands of a Government emanating from the people, and now unquestionably amenable to the people, whose character it expresses; or shall that instrument be put into the hands of a body of ecclesiastics nominated by a foreign Bishop, whose subjects they ostentatiously declare themselves to be?

Let not these remarks be deemed irrelevant, since it is manifest, though nowhere in terms avowed, that the destruction of the Church of England would not be considered by any one of the gentlemen I have named as a calamity. One and all represent the two Churches as of similar character. The very titles of the sermons shew this. "Popery in all Churches the proper Object of Protestant Antagonism," says Mr. Robberds. "Ecclesiastical Pretensions, Romish and English," is the watchword of Mr. Thom. Nowhere is the eventual destruction of the English Church, and the substitution of the Church of Rome in its place, adverted to as a calamity. In this I see a want of discernment akin to that of the unfortunate frogs in the fable, who were taught by bitter experience to see the great difference between King Log and King Stork. May a like fate be averted from this land!

A branch of this State Church topic is the reference, so fertile in misrepresentation, to the *Supremacy of the Queen*. On this point Dr. Wiseman makes what he affects to consider as a conclusive appeal to the Protestant Dissenters. You, he says, acknowledge as little as we do the Supremacy of the Queen, and have no right to resent a contempt on our part in which you share. My reply would be that of Mr. Thom. Speaking of the Dissenters as a body, I answer, We can without hesitation acknowledge the Queen to be the Head of the Church—not of Christ, but of England. We deny the pretended authority of that Church over ourselves, but we acknowledge her Majesty's authority over her willing subjects as a portion of her Royal prerogative, she being "supreme over all persons, ecclesiastical as well as civil," to use the words of the Bishops in their late address to the Queen,—by which we assert merely this, that at the head of the State she administers its power in all the offices of government by her Ministers, and in conformity with the law of the land. We are far from imagining that she possesses such a power as is implied in the last No. of the Christian Reformer, p. 771: "It is not by substituting the Queen's Supremacy for that of the Pontiff of Rome, &c., that Popish aggression is to be withstood." These words tend to confirm the most erroneous notions concerning this Supremacy. The moderate and reasonable portion of the Church mean nothing that resembles Papal Supremacy. That which they maintain is purely administrative, and respects only the secular concerns of the Church. In the highest spiritual sense, the

Church wants no Head, though practically there is an inconvenience in the want of an accessible and universally recognized Head, as is found in all matters of litigation. With this want of a visible authority and head the Church of Rome taunts the Protestant Churches; and the late High-church denial of the Queen's Supremacy as it is now recognized, is but a step towards the obtaining hereafter an organization that may approximate to the Romish Church, and under the pretext of removing the reproach of Erastianism, industriously re-establish the power of the priest; for the Supremacy of the Queen being taken from her, must be given to the priest. His power is seen in a state of highly-condensed malignity, as we maintain, in the Church of Rome, which its members conceive to be merely a state of perfect efficiency. I can here only advert in a sentence to the seeming paradox of Dr. Arnold, who maintained the identity of Church and State, he almost alone of Churchmen being fully aware of the sad mistake which practically considers the clergy as the Church, though it affirms the contrary. To those who acknowledge that the laity are the Church, and who consider the Queen as the representative of the nation in all the executive branches of the government, her Supremacy is in substance but the supremacy of the nation, that nation being, it is assumed, Christian. This most important reference to the Anglican Church as the *national* Church, is absolutely overlooked by every Unitarian writer and speaker we have heard of,—a consequence of their sectarian view of the subject, as if the question concerned them merely as Dissenters, and not as Englishmen.

Next in importance to the flagrant injustice manifested towards the Church of England, is the really astonishing extravagance of representing the expected prohibition of the erection of a Church Establishment by the Pope as a violation of civil and religious liberty. This is common to the writers and speakers in question. It is but justice, however, to remark that no one of them affects to consider the Romish Church as changed or capable of change. An amiable M. P., who seems inclined to follow in the wake of Messrs. Hume and Roebuck, said to me lately, "I know they would burn me to-morrow if they could; but this makes no difference." And at the Unitarian District Society meeting, one solitary speaker, opposing the general sentiment, said, THE TIME IS COME WHEN WE MUST OPPOSE INTOLERANCE TO INTOLERANCE!!! which is reported with this typographic criticism in the *Inquirer*,—though all the speaker could have meant was this just suggestion, that when engaged in defensive war we must use the weapons employed against us. This sad misapprehension originates, probably, in a very general misunderstanding concerning the nature of liberty, which is essentially negative and passive. In France it is by every one, and in England by very many, confounded with popular power. I will borrow an illustration from early ecclesiastical history. The primitive Christian martyrs suffered death rather than offer up incense before a Pagan idol, and for this their names have been ever held in honour and their murderers execrated. In a later age, the descendants of these martyrs, whose horror of idolatry had increased, became iconoclasts, and they too were willing to suffer death for the outrages which they thought it their duty to perpetrate on the idols which the State had erected. Now, with every inclination to respect

even the fanaticism of that zeal which authenticates its sincerity by martyrdom, it must in candour be acknowledged that the merit of the sufferers was not the same, nor was the reproach due to the vindication of the law the same as in the case where the martyr merely refused to perform an act of seeming idolatry.

With the heightened zeal of the iconoclasts increased the tenacity of priests in maintaining the public images. This led to an act of horrible cruelty in France in the year 1766, by which all Europe was scandalized. Some young French officers in a drunken frolic broke off an arm from a statue of the Virgin at Abbeville, for which the Chevalier de la Barre was broken on the wheel. This incident, and the execution of Calas for a falsely-imputed murder, contributed more than any other events of the day to bring Christianity into disrepute, spread over Europe the notion that cruelty and injustice were inseparable from the priestly character, and gave popularity to the writings of Voltaire and the French school of infidelity. But what irritated the moral sense of enlightened Europe was, in the case of La Barre, the disproportion between the crime and the punishment. He was undeniably a legitimate object of punishment.

To apply these facts to the subject before us. There are other idols than those of wood and stone; and, to narrow the field of controversy, it may be conceded that the Church of England is justly an idol in the eyes both of Romanists and Protestant Dissenters. Under the Stuarts the Dissenters were ordered to worship this idol by attendance in its temples, and abstaining from attending in rival temples; and grievous was the persecution they endured rather than comply. They are now relieved from the obligation to burn incense, and they are content. Not so the Romanists; and the Pope of Rome, by issuing his Bull and establishing his hierarchy, must be considered as in effect breaking the idols of the State; or, if this be denied, at least he is guilty of the impertinence of setting up his own idols by the side. It pleases some Dissenter to say, "With all my heart—one is as bad as another." I hope I have shewn that this is not the fact; but were the Roman and Anglican Churches otherwise the same, at least one is the idol of the nation, erected by the national will; the other is an insolent imposition upon the nation by an Italian priest. To consider the repression of this as a violation of liberty, is to overlook its character of obtrusive insolence,—an act I have no doubt cunningly contrived to place our Government in a dilemma, the perpetrators hoping to profit whether their act be tolerated or resisted, and going out of their way to perform it. If it be allowed, the Romanists take their stand in an advanced position, and the alleged inconsistency of repression will become greater. If prohibited, these meek sufferers, the successors of Dominic and Loyola, will raise a sham cry of persecution. I say a sham cry, though our Unitarian friends have, in a tone to my mind equally incomprehensible and deplorable, raised it for them, in, I hope, a correct anticipation of Government measures of prohibition. I call this a sham cry, because I think that, though every Christian man may rightfully refuse to perform an act which is made to appear voluntary and therefore becomes an acted lie, and he may honestly plead his conscience as a reason for his disobedience, yet that plea of conscience becomes a pretext which the Government may disregard when it is alleged to justify

measures of offence against the law of the land, which enforces the State conscience. The Dissenter may refuse to burn his incense, but he has no right to break the altar, and thereby disable others from sacrificing. While he asserts his own liberty, let him respect the liberty of others. This I believe to be one of the severest trials imposed on earnest believers, but it is one that no Government can be reproached for imposing.

I rejoice that I am at liberty to lay aside some remarks which I had made on the Bull, because no one defends it; yet I may be allowed an observation on a most extraordinary argument used by the most plausible and ingenious, as well as able, of these Unitarian ministers. We have, says Mr. Thom, no right to be "violent and angry," because, though the Roman Church has done this act "in an arrogant and offensive way," that springs "*not from the wilful insolence of her temper, but the necessity of her first principles*"! Be it so; we will for the nonce forego the right to be angry, and calmly say that we too have first principles which do not permit us to submit to the offence and arrogance of the Papal Government. It is elsewhere said in the same discourse, that this arrogance is in the very spirit and conception of the Romish religion, and cannot be separated from her without removing her essence and destroying her life. "It is quite out of date to complain of it now, as if it was a new offence." This is true; but it is never out of date to adopt measures of precaution and to protect ourselves against it. This Mr. Thom will not deny. Indeed, no one of these gentlemen wishes for the success of the Pope, and they are not without hope that, after all, the Anglican Church may escape. There is, they say, but one way of successfully resisting the Church of Rome. If you continue as you are, you must be crushed. Reformation is necessary. Far from me any wish to weaken the force of any exhortation to the Church to reform; but if, in spite of all exhortations, she will not, I will not therefore sacrifice the nation to her obstinacy, and give any aid in the attempt to set up and establish the Church of Rome in England as a rival body. Least of all would I impose it as a condition of my giving such aid as I could to the National Church, that she should become rational and Unitarian. I have heard intelligent Unitarians say, there is no consistent scheme between Romanism and our Church. This I do not deny; but there are in fact many other schemes which are practically less mischievous, and that even because of their inconsistency. One passage from Mr. Thom's concluding page I will copy, that this paper may at least have a sentence that may be read again and again with pleasure: "I hope that the lesson of this time.... will be in the direction of that true and primitive Protestantism which seeks salvation through the heart's trust in a holy and regenerating Love;.... which sets aside the debateable letter of all creeds, to enthrone the indubitable spirit of Christ; which deposes *all* pretensions to Authority or Infallibility as alike evil and dangerous; which substitutes an attainable unity of affection for an unattainable and undesirable unity of thought," &c. But, beautiful as this is, I must nevertheless earnestly protest against the final words which terminate the discourse—"Therefore, let them alone."

This leads me to the last topic on which I shall venture to address you, and that is the insensibility to the danger arising from this Papal

movement. This, I confess, seems to me to partake of what the pious have called a judicial blindness. If you reply to this by treating my fears as belonging to the cowardice incident to old age, I cannot be offended; I should be thankful to any one who could convince me of this. This crafty measure of the Pope, which emanates probably from Paris, places the steersmen of the State between Scylla and Charybdis. On the one hand, the resistance must be so prudent and discriminating as to afford no pretext for the cry of persecution; and as nothing actually given and enjoyed can be safely withdrawn, Ireland must be left as it is. Believing, with Dr. Arnold, that Ireland was entitled to have the Church of her people established, I would exempt that country from all the enactments of whatever law may be passed. For, on the other hand, this Papal Bull must, as it easily can, be denied public execution in this country; otherwise the impetus given to Romanist pretensions will be of irresistible force. This is not perceived by any one of our Unitarian friends; and instead of fear, I observe only contempt. One Rev. gentleman delighted his audience by "*the most supreme contempt*" for the Pope. It occurred to me that this despised man probably counts more millions among his devoted "*subjects*," than this gentleman has scores of hearers in his chapel. I hope he also despises the Emperor Nicholas, and did despise the "*petit Caporal Napoleon*," and would have despised in their day Attila and Genghis Khan, and, were he a hunter in the wilderness, would despise the rattle-snake and the tiger. That individuals should utter such sentiments is of no consequence, but that such sayings should be applauded affords a sad measure of the popular understanding.

I do not presume to say, what none but a lawyer could dictate, what precise measure of prohibition the Government should adopt. I rejoice to find that the Duke of Norfolk has adopted the wise declaration of Lord Beaumont, who with admirable propriety has asserted the important difference between appointing a Bishop to rule over the Romanists dwelling within a given district, and erecting Sees within her Majesty's dominions; which these Catholic Peers acknowledge to be an insolence to which the Queen of England ought not to submit, but which our Unitarian friends consider as a subject too insignificant to be worth the consideration of a wise man. What's in a name? The wisest of all poets has with admirable propriety put this question into the mouth of the love-sick Juliet. But I cannot compliment our reverend friends for the adoption of it. I cannot set a limit to the influence which names and all the other appendages of power have on the imaginations and consequently the opinions of men. He only can be ignorant of this who sees no difference between granting liberty to the Roman Catholic and allowing the Pope local jurisdiction in the land.

As the Government, in the most just exercise of its sovereign authority, may prohibit the assumption of the name, so it may prohibit penally the recognition of it by others. A penalty is imposed on newspapers which advertise lotteries or other illegal acts; a like penalty might be imposed in this case. The Post-office distributors might be ordered not to convey any letter bearing a titular direction, &c.

In the progress of this measure of State resistance I shall not be deterred from taking a part because I perceive that I am acting to the same end with others who are under influences to which I am not ex-

posed. I shall be anxious only not to be diverted from the pressing object by other considerations.

I shall rejoice if, when this prohibition has been successfully carried through, it be followed by a reform in the Church; but I would not impose that as a condition.

And I hope that there will be on the part of the nation so strong a sense of the emergency, that they will not suffer any measure to be thwarted to answer party purposes in Parliament. Mr. Hume has made a notable discovery,—that Lord John Russell's letter is a cunning contrivance in order to prevent Mr. Hume's carrying his threatened motion for a further Parliamentary reform! This is really pleasant. It is the only comic feature in the case.

That in Parliament this will be mixed up with party questions is certain; but the reasonable men will be willing to postpone deciding who are most to blame in this business, the Puseyites or the Government. Let them but agree in this, that whoever has promoted the measure is culpable, I am content for the present; as I am, to leave till this great evil is averted, all other matters undetermined. Least of all do I care for the effect which the forthcoming discussion will have on the character of the Ministry. I willingly leave Lord John Russell to defend his personal consistency as well as he can. I rejoice in his letter as a pledge that cannot well be abandoned. Equally indifferent am I to the argument, borrowed by Mr. Thom and others from Dr. Wiseman,—You cannot now prohibit this act without acting inconsistently with your former forbearance. *N'importe;* we will be inconsistent. I should not hesitate to advise the Ministry, if pressed, to plead guilty to the charge. There is no offence for which so slight a penance is imposed, as that which is evidenced by a coming over to our own opinions; as there is no character more cherished than the convert, though every convert is of necessity an apostate in other eyes, and, as such, in correspondent measure hated and despised.

But I break off; not that the subject is exhausted, but because I am sensible of having already put your good-nature to too severe a trial. Before you will have to exercise your patience on these rambling suggestions, the anxiety which we must both, I think, feel, will be to a degree removed, for the intentions of the Ministry will be ascertained. May they be such as the national honour and the protection of its spiritual and temporal rights require; if not, may they be corrected by the national sense!

H. C. R.

LINES TO A SLEEPING INFANT.

Baby! on thy mother's breast
Dream thy little dream of rest;
Stir not, sweet, thy tiny headlet,
Thou canst find no softer bedlet;
Life is long and all before thee,
Living love is watching o'er thee!

Dreamlet, lovelet,—all thou art—
Idol of thy mother's heart;
Simple, feeble, fairy thing,
Beauteous as the bud of spring,
Shadowy as the morning mountain,
Stainless as the summer fountain!

Weak—how weak!—a touch might wound thee,—
Strong to move all hearts around thee;
For thy look, thy laugh, thy smiles,
Mother watcheth, father toils.
Wondrous being, strangely lent,—
Mute, yet more than eloquent!

Tiny form bewrapt in slumber,—
All the wishes couldst thou number,
All the cares on thee expended,
Thoughts in which thy form is blended,
Hopes and prayers sent up for thee,
Oh! how worthy wouldst thou be!

Pillowed softly, softly dreaming,
Not a mortal thing beseeming;
O'er thee earth hath cast no shadows,
Thou dost stray in lovelier meadows;
Sunny vales by stream and wild wood;
Yes! dear heaven enwraps our childhood.

Sleep, oh! sleep, and dream, my child,
Of the bright, the undefiled:
Heavenly visions dost thou see?
Angels—speak they love to thee,—
Cherub groups around thee stand?
Linger in the spirit-land!

Soon—too soon—thou must awaken,
But to find thy dream mistaken;
Wake to taste life's mirth and madness,
Drink her cup of woe and gladness,—
Wake to earthly hopes and fears,
To seek thy heaven through toils and tears:

Wake to see what darkly lowers
O'er this wistful world of ours:—
Life—for virtue, struggle meant;
Grief—for teaching, trial sent:
He the greatest, noblest, strongest,
Bearing, daring, hoping longest!

Baby on thy mother's breast,
Dream thy little dream of rest;
Stir not, sweet, thy fairy headlet,
Thou canst find no softer bedlet;
Life is long and all before thee,
Living love is watching o'er thee!

Diss. S. F. M.

ORIGINAL LETTERS OF THE LATE DR. PARR TO DR. HOLME, OF MANCHESTER.

[We have received permission to print the following highly characteristic letters of Dr. Parr. They are not, except the signature and few preceding words, in the Doctor's handwriting, but in that of three scribes who appear to have written from the Doctor's dictation. In some cases their errors in the names of persons seem to have been corrected by Dr. Parr. Others, known to us to be errors, we have corrected.—Dr. John Johnstone, in his edition of the Works of Dr. Parr (VII. 605), lamented that he had been unable to extract from Dr. Holme any account of his correspondence and connection with Dr. Parr. We are able only in part to supply the deficiency lamented by Dr. Johnstone. Of the other letters of Dr. Parr to Dr. Holme, some are missing and others are unsuitable for publication. A few notes, illustrative of some of the persons and places named, are added.—Ed. C. R.]

[This letter is without date, nor does the post-mark (Warwick) supply the deficiency; but from internal evidence supplied by the letter when compared with Dr. Parr's printed correspondence (Works, VII. 615, 616), there is good reason for assigning it to May or June, 1805.]

Dear Sir,

After the instances of insidious and mischievous diplomacy which occurred some time ago in my neighbourhood, after your neglect of the long, confidential and friendly letter in which I acknowledged your civilities and kindnesses to me, and after the sight of a date from Turton and a post-mark from Bolton, I could be at no loss to account for the alteration of mind and of language which was deliberately introduced into the paper which you wrote to me last December.* But while I lament the alienation of your good-will, I shall not follow your example, for I never can cease to remember, or remembering to estimate highly, your talents, your attainments and your honourable principles. I shall always take a lively interest in your happiness, and always rejoice in the opportunities afforded me for doing prompt and plenary justice to your distinguished merit. Upon every account it would ill become me to indulge any curiosity, or express any anxiety, about the possible sources of that change which you have experienced. But when I compare the keenness of your general discernment, with the instability of your particular attachment to myself, I cannot help reflecting, and entreating you to reflect, upon the very strong facts which you communicated, and the very pointed observations which you made, upon the trickeries and the subtleties, the restlessness and the lubricity, the specious exterior and the hollow interior, of one whom it is needless for me to name. Every instinct of self-preservation and every feeling of self-respect will determine me to stand aloof from that person, and the future accumulation of interests may rouse me to measures which the most skilful veteran in stratagem and falsehood may be unable to baffle. Well, dear Sir, I am glad that you and I

* Whatever had been the occasion for the temporary alienation between Dr. Parr and Dr. Holme, it was entirely removed, for in the December following we find Dr. Holme welcoming Dr. Parr as a guest at Manchester, and assuring him of his respect in the following terms:—"I shall be able, I hope, to convince you when we meet, that, however flagrant my offences as a correspondent have been, they have not proceeded from a deficiency of veneration for your talents, of esteem for your virtues, or of gratitude for the numerous and kind attentions you have been pleased to shew me."—Works of Dr. Parr, VII. 606.

parted at Manchester with sentiments of mutual kindness; and putting your worth into the balance against your infirmities, I shall continue to esteem, regard, and to respect you. It is probable that you and I shall never see each other again, and for this, which I really consider as a privation of happiness, the responsibility lies with you alone. But I beseech you to remember in your calm and serious moments, that such men as you and I ought not to trifle with the delicacies or duties of friendship, and that among the changes and chances of life, or in the awful moment of a death-bed, the violation of them may inflict upon us the most poignant anguish.

Supposing that your estrangement from me has not produced any discourtesy to our common acquaintances, I beg the favour to present my best compliments and best wishes to Mr. and Mrs. Greg, to Mr. and Mrs. George Philips, to Mrs. Barrett, to Mr. Hawkes, to Peter Ewart and his lady, to Tom Kershaw, to the excellent William Henry, his wife and aunt, and to our hospitable friend Mr. Faulkner Philips and all his sons and daughters. I feel satisfaction in looking back to the agreeable hours I have spent with them, nor shall I dissemble the regret which I suffer from the conviction that with the same worthy persons I shall no more experience the same social enjoyments. I thank you for your intelligence about the books, and have written proper directions to Mr. Ford. I shall very soon put up the books you lent me in a box, and have them forwarded to you, together with the Ibis and the little collection of Greek poems. As to the inscription for Mr. Lloyd,* I told you before, and I tell you again, that I meant to put up the memorandums when I left Manchester, but upon opening my papers I could not find them; that I wished you to look for them; and that upon your not finding them, I should be glad to receive from your memory and your taste such notices as would enable me to say what was right for your much-respected friend. If those notices come to me I will write the inscription, and if they do not, I cannot write it, but must leave Mr. Lloyd to employ you or somebody else. It was for your sake that I undertook the task, and for yours I am now ready to execute it, when the means are in my power. I have sent to Mr. Percival† the inscription for his

---

* George Lloyd, Esq., Barrister, of Manchester, who died at Bath, Oct. 12, 1804, in the 55th year of his age. Dr. Parr wrote an English inscription for his monument, which is preserved in his Works, IV. 660, 661.

† This was probably Dr. Edward C. Percival, who was Dr. Parr's correspondent respecting the inscription in memory of his father. Dr. Parr, in fact, composed two inscriptions in memory of Dr. Percival, both in Latin (Works, IV. 603, 604),—one for the monument in the parish church at Warrington, the other for the walls of the rooms of the Literary and Philosophical Society at Manchester. The following passage is part of a letter from Dr. Edward Percival to Dr. Parr, dated Manchester, May 21, 1805:—"No higher gratification could be conferred upon me than to have a memorial on the walls of the Society from your pen. Dr. Holme joins me in the same sentiment. * * * The Literary and Philosophical Society originated in the stated weekly meetings for conversation which my father held at his own house. These meetings becoming gradually more numerous, the members at length formed themselves into a tavern club, which in the year 1781 was constituted a regular society, and denominated the 'Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester.' Of this institution my father was appointed joint President with another gentleman, at whose death he became sole President, a situation to which he was ever afterwards *annually*

father, and have altered it in conformity to some suggestions which he lately made to me. I return Miss Lloyd's letter to you, and am,

Dear Sir,

Your sincere well-wisher and obedient, humble servant,

S. Parr.

To Dr. Holme, Manchester.

The following memorandum, without date, appears to contain notes of an interview with Dr. Parr,—probably at Kendal, where Dr. Holme's sister lived,—by some friend of the Holme family.

"Some people buy books to look at; Ned* buys them to read. I love Ned. I have him here," putting his hand to his heart. "I have a small book Ned lent me; I was to leave it with his sister; as she is not at home, you will perhaps take care of it?"

Speaking of his eldest daughter, he observed, "She was one of the finest women in England; I educated her myself."

"Then you made her a liberal, Doctor?"

"I made her a Christian, Sir!"

He mentioned having given away all his plate, worth £1700. The Dr. intimated a wish to go to church next morning. I told him I had some acquaintance with the Mayor, and would speak to him for a sitting in the Corporation pew. He asked if I could not go with them, and wished me to mention his name to the Mayor. He did not choose to walk in the procession, nor to go late. I intimated a wish to (*hear?*) him preach. He said it was not usual with him when he travelled. We set off in good time, and when we got into the churchyard he seated himself on a tomb-stone. Wishing to hear the bells, he inquired of the sexton the weight of the tenor bell. We then followed the Corporation, and were seated on the front bench of their pew. He inquired where he could most easily call on Mr. Brougham. I told him from Penrith. I asked him if he meant to return this way. He said they should return by York.

"If Charles Fox had lived, and had [*it?*] in his power, I should have been a Bishop. I shan't ask for it, but if offered should not refuse."

Hatton, July 8, 1819.†

Dear Dr. Holme,—Your letter was most friendly and most interesting. I shall bring with me the Medical Magazine, and I have no

---

elected. His attendance at the meetings of this Society was rarely prevented by any other cause than the interruption of health; his contributions, both literary and philosophical, were frequent and various; whilst his earnest zeal, not less than his candour and moderation, seemed peculiarly to fit him for the leading office which he sustained. The resolution of the Society to erect a monument to his memory was passed unanimously, very shortly after his death."

* Dr. Holme.

† Amongst Dr. Holme's papers was found a letter from Dr. Parr of a previous date, "July 16, 1813," detailing at considerable length some of his reasons for breaking off his intimacy with Sir James Macintosh previously to his sailing to Bombay. Though painfully interesting, we think it due to the memory of both these eminent men not to avail ourselves of the permission granted us to print this letter.

other book of yours. In truth, the subject which is strongly impressed upon your mind is seen very distinctly by my own. I will state to you my opinion. You knew the man well. You loved him much. Collect your own thoughts. Select such as seem to you the most apposite, and throw the matter into a rough form of Latin. Then let me read again the general materials, and I shall be able to correct. There seems to me no other practical method, so far as I am concerned.

I shall bring with me Bentley's Correspondence. His arrogance is most odious. He treated no man so ill as he treated Le Clerc; and if the choice were given me to have Bentley's knowledge or Le Clerc's, I should, after some hesitation, decide not for Bentley's. Still, as an Editor of Menander, Le Clerc was out of his element, for he has no nice tact for verbal emendation. He was not quick-sighted in Atticisms and Ionicisms, and he knew very little of metre. But he was a very great man in much greater things.

Now, my dear Sir, my travelling companions are not here. But I can say positively that we shall reach Manchester on the 19th in the evening. I shall rest there for one day, which day is the 20th, and the next day I must leave you. Mine is a very extended and a very diversified plan, in the execution of which I must often surrender my own wishes to the convenience of my comrades. They on the 20th will employ the morning in going to the Collegiate church, to your Town Library,* and to George Philips's manufactory, if you can get leave for them to see the latter, and somebody must point out to them the Town Cross where the Jacobin *(Jacobite)* rebels were executed.† They, dear Sir, will take up their abode at the Bridgewater Arms. I shall, in conformity to your kind request, cause myself to be set down in Brown Street.

I must be excused, if possible, from calling upon any one whatsoever. I hear from many quarters of your professional activity, which

---

* Established by the highminded Lancashire Puritan, Humphrey Cheetham, who died 1653.

† In the rebellion of 1715, after the defeat of the rebels at Preston, numerous trials and condemnations took place. About seventy prisoners were tried by a special commission at Liverpool. Thomas Syddal and four others were, for the sake of example, removed to Manchester and there executed. Their heads were exhibited on the Market Cross. Syddal was a peruke-maker and a violent Jacobite. At his instigation, in 1714, a furious mob attacked and destroyed the Dissenting meeting-house (at that time the only one in Manchester) in Aca's Field, now Cross-Street chapel. For this crime Syddal was arrested and committed to Lancaster Castle, but he was rescued thence by the Scotch rebels on their southward march through Lancaster. The Cross seen by Dr. Parr's friends was not the original structure, but a rebuilding of the date of 1752. The original Cross was then removed to High Street, but has long ceased to exist. The son of Syddal took part in the rebellion of 1745, and held the rank of adjutant in the Pretender's army. He was executed for this treason, in 1746, on Kennington Common. His head and that of Captain Deacon and another were brought down to Manchester and exposed upon the front of the Exchange, within a few yards of the spot where his father's head had been exhibited thirty years before. Capt. Deacon was the son (one of two who fell in this rebellion) of Dr. Deacon, a Nonjuring physician and bishop of some celebrity. The Dr. was the first to visit the mutilated remains of his son, on which he gazed with intense reverence, and expressed his joy that he had a son who could firmly suffer martyrdom in the cause of his Sovereign.

must necessarily lead to professional eminence, and to those pecuniary advantages which you slighted so long, and which you so amply deserve. I therefore shall joyfully accept of your invitation to dinner. But I entreat you, dear Sir, again and again, to make no expensive preparation. You can always furnish a banquet for the mind. Pray have no salmon, nor any costly fish; and I hope lobsters, of which I am immoderately fond when they are warm, should not be considered as costly, and if they are, I interdict them.

Remember my fondness, as I remember yours, for veal cutlets, with dainty and very copious sauce. You will permit me to bring my two comrades to dinner, and desire Mr. Hawkes * to assist them in seeing the town, and to procure a ticket for Philips's manufactory. My acquaintance with George † has ceased; but he has some good qualities, and I am very much pleased with his Parliamentary conduct. I continue to esteem his wife. Now as to the party, it must not be large, because I shall be very much fatigued. Let us have Dr. Henry, Tom Kershaw, Faulkner Philips, and my brother Hawkes, whose sterling good sense I shall ever admire. I am afraid to mention ———, after his late misfortune. He is no common man, though his excellencies are a little obscured by the peculiarities which more or less adhere to all Nonconformists. Parson Hawkes is more exempt from these imperfections than any conventicle preacher I ever saw. I wish that he or his vestry folks would give me a copy of the printed Service used in the Unitarian chapel. I read it attentively, and I have publicly mentioned it with approbation as to its spirit before some crowded and enlightened congregations. Your letter came to me last night. In the morning I had a visit from Mrs. Waddington, who has lost a little of her beauty, but retains her vivacity and ingenuity. She desired me to look at a very learned and a very argumentative book written by her son-in-law, Mr. Busens *(Bunsen?)*, Secretary to the Prussian Legation at Rome. I charged her to encourage Busens in correcting, enlarging and republishing his admirable work, De Jure Atheniensium Hereditario. It is replete with history, jurisprudence, ethics and philology. He was a scholar of Heyne. His Latinity is now and then involved in the German way, and I told her my wishes for him to disentangle his meaning from the lengthened and intricate swathes of his sentences. I thank you for your polite attention to Mrs. Parr. She often rambles in the neighbourhood. But she does not accompany me upon any long tour, and I told her plainly my opinions and determinations upon this subject before I married. I honour your sister for her patriotism and her heroism. I hope that your prudent and professed neutrality does not amount to apostacy. Events justify your real tenets and my own. Keep aloof from the ultra-Reformers; but do justice to the Constitutionalists, and disdain to enter into a holy alliance with the Tories of our days. Pray, dear Sir, do not ask more persons than I have mentioned. I am grieved not to have Dr.

---

* Rev. William Hawkes, the minister of the second Presbyterian congregation in Manchester, worshiping then in Mosley Street, now removed to Upper Brook Street.

† Mr., afterwards Sir George Philips, M. P. for Poole, father of the present Baronet.

Smith* with us, and the Norwich Unitarian parson.† But the party will be too large. I think that you may admit Robert Tweddell. Choose for yourself. Remember me to all my friends. Some I shall see for the last time, and others I shall see no more. But such is the lot of man. God bless you!

I am truly your friend and respectful, humble servant,

SAMUEL PARR.

P.S. I shall very much wish to sleep at your house. My trusty servant Samuel will sleep at the inn.

Hatton, Sept. 2 (probably 1823).

Dear and learned Dr. Holme,—I am going to ask a favour which you can hardly refuse to me. When I was with you at Manchester three years ago, you permitted me to read, and for a short time to take away, a duodecimo work of Dr. Lawrence upon the Dropsy. I felt the same charm that you do from the matter and the style, and I pointed out one mistake, of which there are two instances in the Lectures of Lawrence upon the Brain. I carefully returned your book. I cannot get it in London. I must entreat your aid. Pray, dear Sir, put the book into the hands of your respected schoolmaster Dr. Smith, and permit one of his boys to transcribe the contents under the immediate inspection of Dr. Smith. I have written to Dr. Smith, and we can depend upon his vigilance to preserve the book from being hurt. When the manuscript is finished, cast your keen and discerning eye, so as to ascertain the correctness of the transcriber. When the thing is done, I should wish you to make up a parcel, to direct it first for me, and then over it to put an envelope, and direct that envelope to Dr. John Johnstone, the Monument House, Birmingham; and pray write two or three lines to Dr. John, and tell him that the parcel is for me. This is the best mode of conveyance.

I hope that you are acquainted with Mr. Calvert, your new Warden.‡ He is a Tory, and he is a Johnian; but you will find in him good sense, various information, polite manners, and qualities to sustain the dignity of his office, without the violence, intolerance and severity of the priesthood.—I hear of you often; I cannot hear too often. Now, Dr. Holme, pray be careful in remembering me respectfully and kindly to the following worthies. Faulkner Philips, George Philips and his lady, the excellent Mr. Philips,§ who bought an estate in my neighbourhood, and all his family, Mr. Wood‖ and his daughter, my old Scotch sweetheart, Mrs. ———, her most accomplished,

---

* Jeremiah Smith, D.D., of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, elected High Master of the Free Grammar-school, Manchester, 1807; also Rector of St. Ann's church, Manchester.

† Rev. J. G. Robberds. "Mr. Robberds, of Manchester, had a classical education in Norwich school. He is an excellent writer of English prose."—Dr. Parr's letter to Archbishop Magee, 1823.

‡ This fixes the date of the letter. Thomas Jackson Calvert, D.D., Rector of Wilmslow, was on the death of Dr. Blackburne appointed, by the influence of Lord Liverpool, Warden of the Collegiate church, and was installed March 8 in that year.

§ The late Robert Philips, Esq., of the Park, near Manchester.

‖ The late Ottiwell Wood, Esq.

scientific and amiable nephew and his wife and their children, the ingenious and eloquent pastor, Mr. Robberds, Ben Arthur, Mrs. Heywood, the constable Bright,* and Robert Tweddell.† Don't forget any one of them. When the MS. of Lawrence's book comes, I shall bind it, make a memorandum of the learned Dr. Holme who permitted me to have it transcribed, and give it a place in my library. Pray remember me to your sister and uncle in Kendal.

Believe me, dear Sir,
Your sincere friend and very faithful, humble servant,
S. Parr.

HEINFETTER'S LITERAL TRANSLATIONS.‡

It would certainly be a most desirable thing to discover some absolute and unerring rule by which the sense of ancient, and especially of Scriptural, writers could be ascertained, without bringing into play the judgment, the feelings, and the previous bias of interpreters. By such a rule we might hope to attain certainty on many an obscure and doubtful point, and at once do away with the main controversies which have divided the Church for ages.

So far as we understand the book before us, its author professes to have discovered such a rule; but we must confess that the results of its application, as manifested in the translations here presented, by no means satisfy us that he has attained any additional certainty of interpretation.

The book opens with a treatise on the Greek prepositions, containing, as we are informed, the results of many years of study, and we gather from the Preface that it is in the rendering of these prepositions that the author considers his translation superior to previous ones. We look in vain, however, for any statements of the grounds of the conclusions to which his long investigations have led him: no passages are cited as illustrations; no reasonings adduced to explain or justify his rules; scarcely, indeed, are the rules themselves enunciated in any clear or intelligible form. We are therefore left to judge of the bare results on their own merits. They are thus briefly announced, p. 10:

"The result of my examination into the significations of the Greek Prepositions, is, that not any of them has any *Definite Signification;* but that each of them has its own *Particular Definite Sense;* which *Sense* is expressed by *Various Forms*, i. e. *Significations*, Dependent on, and Regulated by, the requirements of the Context. My reasons for this opinion will be found in my observations on each of the Prepositions."

Then follow immediately remarks on each of the prepositions, consisting in each case of a statement of the relation expressed and not expressed, with a list of the significations usually assigned. The

---

* The late Mr. Benjamin Heywood Bright. Manchester was at this time governed by a boroughreeve and two constables. Mr. Bright was an intimate friend of Dr. Holme. Abandoning business, he betook himself to the profession of the law and the zealous pursuit of literature.

† Rev. Robert Tweddell, of Ardwick, near Manchester, editor of the Remains of John Tweddell.

‡ An Examination into the Significations and Senses of the Greek Prepositions. Also, a Literal Translation of the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, &c. By Hermann Heinfetter. London. 1850.

reasons promised above occupy about a page, and are given in his remarks on the preposition ἐν. They amount to this, that as the preposition is variously rendered according to the context, the signification belongs to the context alone, and not to the preposition, which might in many cases be left out, since it expresses nothing. His remarks on the individual prepositions are in all cases worded very nearly alike, and all conclude with the same formula. As a specimen, we give his remarks on παρά.

"This word Expresses Exclusively, that the Sentence of the Preposition has no *Proper Relation*, it either expressing itself, the complete Sense conveyed by it, or a Sense, that in no way Changes the Sense of that with which it is connected, in such case, it being only the Expression of a Particular added thereto; consequently, the Preposition in no degree Expresses anything respecting, *Origin*, *Object*, *Result*, *&c. &c. &c.* Hence παρα may be Translated anything pointed out by the Context that is consistent with the True Sense expressed by παρά."

Similar remarks are made on each preposition, the conclusion being constantly the same. "Hence ἀμφί, ἐκ, &c., may be Translated anything pointed out by the Context that is consistent with the True Sense expressed by ἀμφί, ἐκ, &c."

Whether there be anything very valuable or very new in this, or whether much aid in the translation of obscure passages will be derived from observing Mr. Heinfetter's directions, we are inclined to doubt. How far they have been useful to himself, we may judge from the translations which form the bulk of his volume. We have first "a Literal Translation" and then an "English Version" of several of Paul's shorter Epistles, beginning with the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. We will give a verse or two from each translation.

1 Thessalonians i. 1, is thus rendered in the Version:

"Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus unto the church in Thessalonica which is in God the Father and Lord of Jesus through Christ: Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father and the Lord of Jesus Christ."

Ch. i. 5 is thus rendered:

"For our gospel came not unto you with promise only, but also with proof, and with a spirit freed from guilt, and with much assurance: as ye know, such dispensers we were among you with respect to you."

Why οἷοι is rendered *such*, why the word *dispensers* is introduced, or what it means, and why the indirect interrogation is so completely ignored and transformed, we know not.

Ch. ii. 5: "For not even once with a word of flattery were we sustained, as ye know; not with a pretext after covetousness; God is witness."

What can this mean? Is Paul complaining that he was not sustained by flattery? How can any one be sustained with a pretext after covetousness? Nor is the matter any clearer in the Literal Translation, which is,

"For not even once with a word of flattery were we existed, i. e. *sustained*. As ye have known, nor with a pretext after covetousness, God a witness *is*."

Can Mr. Heinfetter bring any passages to prove that ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας γίγνεσθαι means to be existed, i. e. sustained with a word of flattery, or to shew that the expression is not a periphrasis for κολακεύειν, just as ἐν σκέψει γίγνεσθαι and δι' ἐρίδος γίγνεσθαι are equivalent to σκοπεῖν and ἐρίζειν? And indeed, in the absence of such examples, one would have supposed the context would have led to

the ordinary rendering, the apostle being engaged in asserting the fearless sincerity with which he addressed them.

In ver. 9 of the same chapter, he translates πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν, "labouring—to the not to have burdened any of your things, i. e. *times of occupation.*"

In what respect this sense, if sense it be, is superior to the common version, "not to be burdensome to any of you," we cannot discover; but that it is not a translation of the Greek is plain to every one.

One more verse, and we have done. Ch. iv. 15 is thus done into English:

"For this we say to you by command of God, that we that are alive, that are left alive at the coming of the Lord, we should not have prevented those that were asleep *at his coming, from participating in the blessings that he brought,*" &c.

The latter half of the verse is intended as a translation of οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας. To our apprehension, it would have been difficult to concentrate in so few words more apparently inexcusable faults. Where does the author find that φθάνω means "to prevent," in the sense of *hindering?* Is it possible that unfamiliarity with English led him to take this meaning from the Received Version, and that his familiarity with Greek was not sufficient to enable him to correct it? Again, by what authority can he justify his translation of so common an idiom as οὐ μὴ with the subjunctive aorist, by "we should not have prevented"? which is not only a false translation, but makes little better than nonsense of the passage; for it is thus made to refer to past time, while it really refers to future. Finally, the same false sense is given in the words, "who were asleep," which can only refer to a time actually past, and yet are joined with the words, "at his coming," which the translator himself will, we presume, allow to be a future event.

That these should be mere blunders, Mr. Heinfetter's assertion that he has devoted many years to the study of Greek, would forbid us to imagine; but they are so extraordinary departures from the already established rules of translation from the Greek, as, unless explained, utterly to shake all confidence not only in the new and definite rules which he thinks he has discovered, but in his sagacity and skill as an interpreter at all.

THOUGHTS BY THE LATE ANNA MARIA PORTER.

[The following passages, extracted from the familiar correspondence of Miss A. M. Porter with some very dear friends, breathe so sweet and gentle a spirit, that they will probably be read with interest even by those who have no personal recollections of the pure-hearted and richly-gifted writer.]

I. *Power of Religion.*

I shall have much to tell you of two extraordinary persons, to whom C. and I pay frequent visits. They are a pair of lovers, whose enthusiasm of love has lasted for five-and-twenty years, though the woman has been confined to her bed nearly all that time, and they did not marry. It is heavenly to behold the resignation of the one, and the devoted tenderness of the other. Last night we sat an

hour by the bed-side of our St. Anne, as we call her, and enjoyed the delight of seeing the purest love embodied in her pale countenance, and in the plain but sensible face of Mr. C. We talked of Mrs. Cappe and Charlotte Richardson, with both of whom she formerly corresponded.

There are certainly many *good* people in this briary world, my friend. I see Mrs. B. lives only to do good; and yet no ostentation, no attempt either to shew or to hide her benevolence; she seems to think it so natural to all mankind, that she never stops to observe that everybody does not do as she does. I hear her complain of the times, find her drink made wines herself, and give away Port and Madeira to all the sick and poor around her. I see decayed gentlewomen who live nearly upon annuities from her, and they are received by her with such equal cordiality, and visit her with such perfect freedom, that, until they told me themselves, I could not have guessed that they were dependent on her bounty. This is genuine Christianity, is it not?

II. *Education of a Daughter.*

Beware of Aunt L.! I shrewdly suspect she will contrive to spoil her niece, even in the course of three months. Whisper to her that I hope she will not teach it contempt of the higher powers. A graceless independence was always a part of *her* creed for children. *I* shall advise a little wholesome prejudice to be instilled into it; a sort of habitual reverence, or rather an aptitude for reverence, towards you and your husband—the authors of its being, and the anxious protectors of its mind and body. You see I am for having your bratty educated by times. The fact is, I am imagining, I believe, that it has come into the world with a stock of reason ready to work upon. However, if it turn out at last but an ordinary sort of a child, talking and walking and speaking and thinking at the same time and in the same manner as other children, I shall not love it a bit the less.

Give your husband my warmest remembrances. He has certainly one of the tenderest and noblest hearts in the world. But that you must keep to yourself.

I did not mean a pun then, though I see I have made one.

III. *Robert Hall.*

I had been prepared for Robert Hall's peculiarities, so that abhorrent grunt of his, between the different members of his sentences, did not assault me as it would otherwise have done. His discourse was most admirable; urging us to take the most elevated standard of excellence for our model—the perfections of the Deity; and proving that such a practice, instead of rendering us self-sufficient and arrogant, must increase Christian humility, from the very difficulty with which we attain even to low degrees of such a divine attribute as Benevolence.

I am not now accustomed to extempore preaching, so perhaps I may overrate the eloquence and energy of Robert Hall; but certainly he seemed to me unequalled by any one I had ever heard, except ——.

IV. *Madame de Staël.*

On Saturday I was presented to Madame de Staël. I was exceedingly charmed with her. In our short interview I saw nothing of that air of pretension, display and dogmatism, with which she has been charged. She was courteous, even to kindness, and said far too little to satisfy my thirst for her conversation. There is nothing plain in her face, but nothing handsome except her eyes; and they have the softness and the effect of moonlight. Her young daughter is very lovely, and appears to be admirably instructed.

V. *Napoleon.*

Mrs. D. has seen you, I find; so she will have told you all our family news; and amongst other novelties, has most likely assured you that we are become fiery Buonapartists—but beware of believing her. Her glowing zeal on the opposite side makes her see no medium between pitying Napoleon and trusting that his regeneration of soul has begun, and considering him an immaculate hero. I confess that both my sister and I are too apt to forget a fellow-creature's crimes in their punishment: and in the present instance, hurled from the empire of the world almost, torn from his wife and child, I seem to see the hand of Heaven laid on him so heavily, that to exhale our spirits against him in wishes for vigorous or contemptuous treatment, would be in my opinion to "bruise the broken reed," and to prove ourselves anything but Christians. *You* know how I have abhorred his ambition, and shuddered at his greatness, while he was the most ambitious and most powerful of men; and you therefore will not set me down as an enemy to my country and good government because I read with shame and indignation the unmanly virulence of the newspapers, and turn with disgust from the persons who would wish him deprived of every friend and follower. I suppose our Ministers and allies have done the best they could, by sending him to St. Helena; but some of the persons employed in getting him there (if we are to credit the newspaper details) have certainly addressed him in the spirit of the coward who strikes a fallen man, and left him to fancy the people of England far from the generous race he supposed.

VI. *Mary, Queen of Scots.*

It is frightful to observe how much the doctrine of *expediency* is acted upon by men in a body, that would shrink from individual crime. For twenty years they were hunting poor Mary into deadly cabals against their Queen, and when they had fairly driven her into the toils, they closed them on her, and triumphantly shewed her to the world a victim and a criminal. Miss Benger realizes my idea of Queen Mary—weak, enchanting, specious in talents, feeble in understanding; incapable of love or passion, yet ever the dupe of some skin-deep fancy; certainly never unchaste.

VII. *Defoe's History of the Plague.*

I read the other day an old, half-forgotten thing of Defoe's, which fearfully interested me—his account of the Plague of London, in the time of Charles the Second. Like all Defoe's able assumptions of

another character than his own, it is too elaborate, wire-spun and tautological; but spite of that, still it has its tremendous beauties.

VIII. *Prejudice dispelled.*

Our clergyman, Mr. ———, read Mr. Aspland's sermon with lively feelings of admiration and approbation. He seemed agreeably surprised to find no difference in the spirit of the two religions. Such convictions blessedly soften prejudices.

IX. *Voltaire.*

I am very glad you are so angry with Voltaire. Shakespear's sublime shade must have smiled with calm disdain at the earthly cur yelping at his brightness. The passages you have compared are indeed striking proofs of Voltaire's disingenuousness, or of his incapacity of translating our bard.

X. *Mrs. Mary Hughes.*

Whether she be or be not a Socinian, I am more and more in love with Mrs. Mary Hughes: her *Henry Goodwin* is beautiful. What extensive good her pen must effect! I never met with any other person's writings like hers: so plain, so unornamented, so calm, yet so instantaneously affecting the moment she wishes to touch the feelings. With her, religion is never separated either from reason or sensibility; and it is from this, I think, her stories must be useful to every class of readers. I can never bear a cold, calculating piety; I am still more shocked at that enthusiastic sort which borrows the language of human passion; I am therefore charmed with Mrs. Hughes because she makes my heart glow, while she convinces my understanding: no religious or moral work has ever awakened in me more lively aspirations after excellence than her stories.

XI. *Parental Affection.*

Blackbirds, thrushes, linnets, larks and nightingales, sing to me all day long. I have now learned all their notes, and the meaning of their different songs. Even the sparrows are not too contemptible to escape notice: a couple of them visit an almond-tree which grows opposite the room I usually sit in, and I have the pleasure of watching them alternately calling for each other, and fluttering from branch to branch with such joy and fondness when they are together! Their nest is above a honeysuckle which covers the parlour windows, and the other evening a whole covey of young ones came fluttering after their father through its fragrant branches. I can't tell you what an affecting sort of enjoyment it afforded me to see the anxious, happy parents, and the timid, yet delighted, little ones. How lovely, how touching, is the contemplation of the parental feeling, even amongst birds and beasts—how much more so in the human race! I do not wonder at the mass of mankind having formerly considered the want of children a curse, a stigma; 'tis a natural superstition: for to parents, I think we may say, the Almighty has granted one of his greatest blessings (that which makes them in some degree partake of his sublime power and happiness)—the privilege of giving existence.

XII. *In Prospect of the Marriage of a Young Friend.*

I hasten to say with what joy I read that your Emma is so soon

likely to fix for life with a man approved by her discerning parents as much as beloved by herself. It does seem to me that she has every prospect of happiness—and the more so, that their moderate fortune will probably keep them ever in that wholesome exercise of the mental faculties and kindly affections without which, I am sure, our happiness, as well as usefulness, is extinguished. You will tell me when she is to be married, that I may think of her and give her a prayer on that day.

XIII. *The Death-bed.*

A death-bed never appears dreadful to me, but when I imagine it lonely, or deserted by the objects dearest to the heart of the dying person.

XIV. *A Friend after Marriage.*

Her heart and her arms were alike open to welcome me; but never did I see a mother so engulfed in her children: not a thought seems *spontaneously* to be diverted from teaching the elder, and nursing, dressing and working for the younger. Yet I cannot *sulk* at this, nor wish it otherwise; at sixteen I might have done both; now, thank God, I can witness these gracious laws of his, which so blessedly couple our greatest happiness with our highest duties, and not wish them altered. My friend still loves me as she did formerly, but she had then one part of her heart unfilled—that set apart for husband and children—now it is occupied: how can I repine?

XV. *Virtuous Friendship eternal.*

I trust that our friendship is laid up amongst those treasures which "moth cannot corrupt, nor thieves break through and steal;" and that we are to come into the full enjoyment of it when we get to heaven: for, in this world, I am sure, it is like a property so tied up, that the owners cannot touch the principal, and scarcely the interest. The tide of life carries us so far from one another; we are thrown into such different sets of society; our duties, our occupations, nay, our very pleasures, keep us so separate, that if there were not an omnipotence in affection which triumphs over all circumstances, we should say at present, "Oh, I remember the time when she and I were the greatest friends in the world!" But I know my own heart, and I am confident of yours; therefore I look on our attachment as on one of those ties of near kindred which is never to be destroyed.

XVI. *Interesting Africans.*

I look for many painful feelings while reading the Tracts* you have had the goodness to send me. Be sure I will spread them as widely as possible; for it is a subject of the deepest interest to me. We were very near having some interesting neighbours of African race, and I am sorry they did not take the house: it was the widow of Christophe, the black Emperor of Hayti, and her daughters. They are Christians, and if I may judge from the very graceful manner of one of the daughters, whom I saw for ten minutes, I should believe what is said of them, that they are women of cultivated minds and amiable dispositions. With a complete Negro face, nothing could be

* On Slavery.

more winning than the soft accent and very courteous address of this lady; and there was a modesty in it entirely feminine.

XVII. *Love of Nature.*

I am much, *much* better; and have almost forgotten all my friends, by encouraging new attachments. However, when I tell you that your rivals are but trees, birds, flowers and air, I suppose you will not meditate any tremendous vengeance: indeed, these charming objects have done both my mind and body so essential a service, that I am bound to love them.

XVIII. *Prejudice.*

Mr. ——* is at present reading Mr. Grundy's Lectures, which at his own request I sent him, together with all the late publications in favour of Unitarianism that have fallen in my way: he told me, when he asked for them, that he should read only with a view of controverting what was advanced in them; for he was sure that nothing that could be said could alter his opinion.

XIX. *London.*

London, with all its odious faults, possesses this virtue—it is the nurse of literary taste. But I don't regret it: if you and B. will come and be read to; and if H. and K. will come and read, I shall sigh for nothing then in the metropolis.

XX. *Mrs. Hutchinson.*

Like you, we closed the volume of Colonel Hutchinson's Life with great regret. How interesting it is; how just a picture it seems to be of the Court and the Parliament! I think Mrs. Hutchinson one of the glories of our sex! It was indeed under her roof that I spent the time you refer to; and it was there I saw an old gardener who had lived with this very Mrs. Hutchinson. He was so old, so deaf, so uncouth in his speech, that I conversed with him through the intervention of his present mistress; on this account my curiosity was imperfectly gratified. When I asked his age, he pointed to a huge mulberry-tree, which was known to be a hundred and ten years old, and said he was a man when that was planted. He spoke of Mrs. Hutchinson (his dame, as he called her) with evident pleasure; said she lived to be very old, and lived only to do good.

XXI. *Grace of the Soul.*

We have F. and his bride amongst us. She is a very charming and amiable person. The first day I saw her here, she struck me as absolutely ugly, spite of her fine figure; but she is gifted with that blessed alchymy of manner and temper which transmutes plainness into beauty, and before she had been here three days I thought her positively handsome: how omnipotent is the grace of the soul!

XXII. *Lines composed in Sleep.*

I cannot forbear amusing you with a whimsical proof of the mind's activity in a favourite pursuit even during sleep. This morning I

---

* A Dissenting Minister.

dreamt of reading a book of MS. verses written from some husband to his wife; and awaking with one poem fresh in my memory, send it to you. Not a single idea has been supplied by my waking Muse, and it is only in the first stanza that she has intruded a few words to repair those I had forgotten.

And does one slight neglect of me
Seem such a crime, sweet Love! to thee
That it should mourn'd and sorrow'd be
With this excess of pain?

If thou indeed hast done amiss,
Pay for thy fault one ruby kiss;
And my fond heart, with selfish bliss,
Will bid thee sin again.

I protest this is a very decent performance, and worthy one of *Homer's nodding* fits!

XXIII. *Sonnet to a Young Friend who had sent her some Verses to criticise.*

If mid the wreath thy hands have wove,
Some useless weeds have mingled with the flowers,
Oh! think not then that in the Muse's grove
Idly have passed away thy valued hours!
For thou wilt find that in the fairest bowers
Some gadding spray, though worthless, oft will rove:
For from rich soils, as fall the vernal showers,
Ill plants will blossom with the buds we love;
But these maturer years and care destroy,
And Judgment, as the pruner, will scatter seeds
That, rising in succession, choke the weeds,
And bloom all lovely to the *Poet's eye.*
So in thy very faults, well pleased, I find
The sweet luxuriance of thy ardent mind.

ON THE PROPHETS.

The Hebrew prophet was a man who had wisdom to foresee the future, who had the power of writing and speaking, and who had that poetic genius which gives persuasiveness and force to the words uttered. He was not a priest or levite or man appointed to a task; but he stepped forward of his own accord to the high office of warning the nation and its rulers. His voice was against sin of all kinds, against injustice, against idolatry, against deserting Jehovah for the Egyptian or Assyrian gods. His wish was to preserve to the chosen people their nationality, to check foreign marriages, foreign treaties and foreign customs. Egyptian chariots and cavalry were hateful in his eyes, fortifications were blameable. He called upon his countrymen to trust in themselves and their God. His words were warm with earnestness, with piety and with hope. When the nation was overrun by foreign armies, was plundered, or even was carried into captivity abroad, he saw in all the hand of a just God punishing them for their sins. He assured them that the day

of punishment, if they repented, would be followed by a day of prosperity. He taught them to look forward to that day, the day of the Lord, as a time when peace would be on earth, their nation prosperous, and Jerusalem would give laws, and Jehovah be acknowledged as the only God.

Writings such as these are sometimes hard to be understood. Earnest feelings poured forth 2500 years ago in a poetic torrent by an Asiatic, may easily be misunderstood by a Western reader. While writing about the future, and to a people who were familiar with the past and the present, the prophets do not always describe even history clearly. Sometimes they even had a reason for not naming the persons whom they speak about. But by comparing their writings with the books of Kings and Chronicles, we can for the most part learn the times when they wrote, and the events which gave rise to their feelings.

The following slight chronological table will shew the dates of the prophetic books and the events mentioned therein:

	B.C.
Jeroboam II., Zachariah and Shallum, kings of Israel, die within the year (2 Kings xv. 8, 14)	773
Chapter xi. of ZECHARIAH written (2 Chron. xxvi. 5).	
After Judah had been invaded by the Syrians, by the Edomites, and by the Philistines, the Assyrians, on the invitation of king Ahaz, come in and complete the ruin (2 Chron. xxviii. 20)	745
The prophet JOEL writes.	
The Syrians are led captives to Kir by the Assyrians (2 Kings xvi. 9)	745
Many Israelites are taken into captivity by Tiglath Pileser (2 Kings xv. 29)	745
Pekah is murdered (2 Kings xv. 30)	731 or 740
The prophet AMOS writes.	
The captivity of the Israelites by king Shalman or Shalmaneser (2 Kings xvii. 6)	722
Jareb or Sennacherib becomes king of Assyria	720
The prophet HOSEA writes.	
Hezekiah pays tribute to Sennacherib at Lachish (2 Kings xviii. 14)	715
The prophet MICAH writes.	
The Assyrians encamp under the walls of Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii. 17)	715
The Assyrian war ceases, perhaps on the accession of Esarhaddon (2 Kings xviii. 37)	713
The prophet ISAIAH writes (2 Kings xix. xx.).	
Chapters ix. and x. of ZECHARIAH written (Isaiah viii. 2).	
Nabopolassar defeats the Assyrians	625
The prophet ZEPHANIAH writes.	
Nabopolassar, the Chaldee king of Babylon, besieges and destroys Nineveh	612
The prophet NAHUM writes.	
Nebuchadnezzar the Chaldee invades Judea	605
The prophet HABAKKUK writes.	
Chapters xii. xiii. and xiv. of ZECHARIAH written.	

B.C.

The captivity in Babylon begins 600
Zedekiah is put to death, and Johanan retreats into Egypt 588
The prophet JEREMIAH writes.
The prophet EZEKIEL writes.
The prophet OBADIAH writes.

Cyrus grants permission for the Jews to return home 536
The later ISAIAH writes (ch. xl.—lxvi.).

Darius decrees that the temple is to be built 520
The prophet ZECHARIAH writes.
The prophet HAGGAI writes.

Nehemiah returns to Jerusalem, and censures the neglect of paying tithes and the marrying foreign wives (chap. xiii.). .. 432
The prophet MALACHI writes.

One only of the Hebrew books seems written at a later period than it purports. The Book of Daniel speaks of circumstances of history in the style of prophecy, but in a manner which leads us to think that they were already past. It was certainly written at various times; and by the help of the events mentioned, we may date its chapters as follows:

B.C.

Ptolemy Philadelphus gives his daughter in marriage to Antiochus Theos of Syria 249
Chapters i.—vi. were written.
Antiochus Epiphanes defeats the Egyptians 169
Chapters vii. and viii. were written.
Antiochus Epiphanes is stopped in Egypt by the Romans, B. C. 168. The Parthians and Armenians revolt against him 165
Chapters x. xi. xii. were written.
The Romans conquer Jerusalem, and set up an aristocracy, 490 years after the first year of Cyrus when the decree was issued for rebuilding the temple 63
Chapter ix. was written.

The poetry of these writers is of the very highest order. In some, the style is earnest, short and full of fire; in others, ornamented and more flowing. As prophecies, they all point to a coming day, called the Day of the Lord, before which the nation is to have misery and trouble, but which is to be followed by peace and prosperity. In the earlier of these writings, that great day is to be followed by the union of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah under one sceptre, by the return of the captives and by the defeat of the Assyrians. In the later writers, this same day is to be marked by the re-establishment of Jerusalem; by the coming of a prince of the line of David, either as an earthly or as a spiritual ruler; by the Gentiles turning to the Jews as their teachers of religion; and by God's reign upon earth.

SAMUEL SHARPE.

THE DIVINE IN CHRISTIANITY.*

The gross errors into which men have fallen respecting the nature, character and uses of Christianity, excite frequent astonishment and pain in the reflecting mind. That they should have misunderstood and misapplied the divine oracles, is a mortifying and in every respect a lamentable truth. The truths of religion have been darkened, its power has been crippled, and its spirit has been broken and imprisoned, by human error, insomuch that the noblest communication of Heaven has reached many human hearts but with a whispered breath, and its first and highest gift has, in too many instances, been scarcely prized. How many centuries of years have measured their course over the earth whilst men have been slowly discovering the great truth, that a divinely-descended religion has for its objects the cordial union of the large family of man, and the moral and spiritual improvement of the many members which compose it! What a foul wrong has been done to the mission and the lessons of the Christ, by elevating a dogmatic theology above those sublime revelations which unfold the true nature, capacities and destiny of man, which proclaim him the heir of immortality, unite the two phases of his life—the finite and the infinite—together, and present their light to guide him to the inheritance upon which, in the enlargement of his spiritual being, he shall enter! But men are at length awaking to their intensest wants and their noblest calling. A strong, a strengthening demand is arising for a more spiritual Christianity than human teachers have sown, broadcast, in the bosom of the world, and there is a pledge shining forth from the horizon of the religious world, that men shall reap a larger, nobler harvest than they have done of the gospel, and a greater glory be reflected from earth to Him who bade it to arise, to shine. Beneath the masses of dark and angry clouds still impending, there are beautiful streams of light gushing forth to refresh the human spirit and to purify the human heart.

At a juncture like this, such a work as that of Dr. Beard's is doubly welcome. We think the religious world greatly indebted to him for the publication. The book harmonizes with the spirit of the age. It recognizes the growing want for spiritual food, and it aims to supply the want. It does more than this. It renders powerful assistance to such as are beginning to feel a want springing up from the depth of their souls, and gives form and meaning to it; enlightens them whilst they feel only a mysterious consciousness that their spiritual growth is dwarfed and confined, but are ignorant as to the true means by which it may be generously enlarged; and then speaks to them in the fulness of its power to impart that true, healthy nourishment for which the soul is pining.

The aim of Dr. Beard in this volume of Discourses is to develop the true nature of revealed religion, and we think he has succeeded in his aim. He shews, rather by inference than direct argument, that it does

---

* Illustrations of the Divine in Christianity; a Series of Discourses exhibiting Views of the Truth, Spirit and Practical Value of the Gospel. By the Rev. J. R. Beard, D. D. Pp. 305. London—Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

not consist of creeds and formularies, that it does not demand an enslaved faith, that it does not license and exalt human authority, that it does not propose reward or punishment upon false principles; whilst he eloquently delineates religion, and traces its power upon the human heart—a purifying and heaven-directing power—shews how it enters into and forms a constituent part of all human virtue, how it sanctifies all human obligations, how it regulates and inflames all human affections, and how it encourages and blesses the noblest aspirations, whether they are blended with the engagements and duties of earth, or fix themselves upon the glorious basis of eternal existence. We call the course of argument pursued by Dr. Beard generous, no less than sound and true. He demonstrates, as we think, that religion consists not so much of the things respecting which there has been perpetual strife, as of the feelings and motives and influences which are common to all men—that it speaks to a principle which is found in the universal heart of mankind, and operates upon this to an extent as unlimited as its own existence, encouraging its growth and enlarging its sphere of influence, until the man becomes in truth a religious being.

The series of Discourses, of which there are no less than forty, is arranged with much order and a due regard to sequence. The learned author lays the foundation and then erects the superstructure like a master-builder. He traces religion through its origin and its evidences, to its genuiue influences upon the heart and life, and then contemplates its glorious results.

Of the literary merit of the work it needs not to say much. Dr. Beard's pen has been so long and so ably devoted to the dissemination of biblical knowledge and the defence of true religion, that no efforts are needed on the part of others to herald his fame. And the many who, aware of the indefatigable industry, the learning and the power of the author, look to the present work as an able and well-conducted exposition of the subject of which it treats, will not be disappointed. The acquirements of the scholar are enlisted in the service of the preacher. In several of the discourses, as in that on the "Divine in Outer Manifestation," his familiar acquaintance with Eastern scenes and manners makes a graceful appearance, and adds to the force of the argument of the discourse. In all there is much originality, as well in the thoughts evolved, as in the general design and arrangement of the subject. The language is lively and yet impressive; the style is varied and adorned with frequent illustrations, and as it is well sustained and vigorous, the mind experiences no weariness, nor longs to arrive at the conclusion before that conclusion is naturally found. Occasionally beautiful and novel thoughts are thrown off in a few words, as thus—"Character is formed, like the coral rocks, by ten thousand tiny depositions." (P. 231.)

With these remarks we proceed to the volume itself, rather to cull a few of its many striking passages, than to give a detailed and elaborate description of the whole. In the "Divine in Man," we think Dr. Beard has touched the true key of the subject, and that he speaks as eloquently as truthfully in the following passage:

"All spiritual knowledge comes from sympathy, and implies congeniality. It is only the divine in man that can feel and recognise the divine in the Son

of God. Holy, disinterested love speaks in vain to the frivolous, the selfish, and the base; it exerts no emotion, it calls forth no response. But two souls that are strung to the same key reverberate each other's notes. The world, as God made it, is full of slumbering harmonies, each of which will awake and peal forth in heavenly music the instant that the correspondent tone is heard. So the divine in Christ awakens the divine in man; and if you would know whether aught of the divine dwells in the human bosom, make the trial in your own case, by placing your souls under the influence of him who at once was our elder brother, and had the spirit of God without measure."—Pp. 38, 39.

The following rules for the study of the Bible have our hearty commendation:

"Discrimination in the study of such a book is indispensable. We must know the origin and aim of each separate writing; the condition of society in which it was produced; the relation which it bears to writings by which it was preceded, and others by which it was followed. We must view the Bible in its separate parts, we must view it also as a whole. We must study the import of each word and each scripture. We must compare together the ideas we thus collect. We must see what they have in common, we must ascertain what is peculiar to certain parts. We must distinguish between what is Jewish and what human, what transient and what permanent, what partial and what universal, what designed for one age and what designed for all ages; and while we leave the one, carefully gather and treasure up the other."—P. 73.

Had such a judicious plan as this been more frequently carried out, it is incredible that so many of the errors of prejudice and blunders of ignorance should have beclouded the world, or that men should have presumed to speak with such false authority to their fellow-men, or exchanged the modesty of human opinion for the arrogance of a presumed infallibility.

Our author could not have carried out his plan fairly and efficiently without touching upon the miraculous history of the New Testament; nay, it especially became him to speak plainly on this point, since the question of miracles is intrinsically a question of the "divine" in relation to the evidences of Christianity. Accordingly, in three consecutive discourses, "The Divine in Outer Manifestation," Dr. Beard reviews the miracle performed by our Lord at Cana; he calmly but forcibly suggests the reasons on which the reality of the miracle is grounded, and successfully establishes its authority as a portion of divine evidence. In the following extract he draws a legitimate inference from the request of the mother of Jesus:

"Her application to Jesus was natural and appropriate. But that application implicates miracle, or, at least, such extraordinary antecedents as rendered miracle probable. Clearly, Mary, the mother of Jesus, believed her son capable of performing what she asked. No one who knows a mother's heart will suppose that she was playing a part. Her sincerity is guaranteed by the natural and simple air which invests the narrative. If, then, she believed her son capable of working a miracle, she believed also that he was the Messiah. Her convictions may be our guarantees. None better than she knew Jesus—none could feel more jealous of his honour. She, as a mother, would sensitively shrink from putting Jesus on any exertion of power in which she was not sure he would be free from failure, and appear to advantage. Her request, under the circumstances, not only is illustrated by, but in its turn confirms, the previous history, implicating events similar in kind to those which are recorded in the other Gospels."—Pp. 90, 91.

He thus expresses the degree of credence which is due to the evangelist:

"The distinct affirmation of the miracle made by John in the narrative, he repeats at a later period in these words (iv. 46): 'So Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee, where he made the water wine.' This repetition is another explicit declaration of the fact. It is the more forcible because casual, and in the circumstances uncalled for. The writer was himself deeply impressed by the miracle. It was natural he should be. Having seen it with his own eyes, and believing it 'manifested forth the glory' of Jesus, he as naturally makes mention of it again in the course of his history."—P. 92.

Pursuing his argument in support of the miraculous history of Christianity, our author gives especial consideration to the greatest and most influential of its miracles, the resurrection of Christ. The whole discourse deserves especial study, and cannot be broken into parts without injury; but we think that it contains a most instructive and eloquent passage in the following summary of the whole argument:

"Christianity has written its own history, on institutions, edifices, tombs, usages, character, society at large. Its career is identical with the course of modern civilisation. Its witnesses are in the lives and deeds of the great men whom it has produced, who form a long line of peerless luminaries stretching from this hour back to the cross and the manger. These are undoubted facts; facts that can no more be questioned than you can deny the existence and exploits of Buonaparte, or the high civilisation and grand achievements of the ancient children of the Nile. These are facts—how do you account for them? Every finite series must have had a beginning. Show me the commencement of this series. I affirm that you cannot, apart from the resurrection. Deny that, and you have a series of facts the most important and wide-spread that the world ever saw, without origin and without cause. These facts have determined the fate of ten thousand times ten thousand men ten thousand times told. They have changed the entire face of the world. They uprooted one religion and planted another. They destroyed the Classic civilisation and substituted the Christian. They have saved myriads from sin, from despair, from perdition; they have refined the purest characters, and enlarged the noblest hearts. They have given birth to a literature whose riches are, for number, like the drops of the ocean, and for variety like the stars of the sky. All these things are involved in the existence and influence of Christianity, and yet this wondrous power, this transforming agency, this angel of the sun, wearing robes of light, chanting songs of liberty, the herald of peace, the harbinger of salvation,—sprang out of nothing. Admit the resurrection, all becomes clear. Deny it, and you have a whole world of effects without the shadow of a cause."—Pp. 112, 113.

Well does the author speak for himself and many others, in his reflections upon the sufferings of our Lord in the immediate anticipation of a fearful death.

"In our self-humiliation and in our admiring reverence are voices from the depths of our heart, declaring, in the words of the centurion, 'Truly, this is a Son of God.' That conclusion I cannot resist if I would; and I would not resist it if I could. That conclusion is trustworthy, or man's deepest and holiest assurances, having a voice, have yet no reality. To that conclusion I cling, because while it tells me of my weakness and reproves me for my sins, leaves me not as those who have no hope, but placing before me, in the majesty of his worth and the tenderness of his pity, Jesus, the Saviour of the world, it offers me most needful and most precious succour, and so giving me hope, restores my spiritual life, and lifts me into regions of thought where, far above the deep shades of our moral Gethsemane, I see forms of beauty in

the city of our God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, which are as bright and as fadeless and as full of benign power as that Veiled Presence before whom they minister day without night."—Pp. 133, 134.

To the soothing power of religion, and to the value of the revelation which accommodates it to the soul in the actual experiences of life, and causes it to flow with healing and comfort and sanctification around the dwellings of humanity, the following testimony must call forth an echo from many a troubled heart:

"In the hour of sorrow, in the hour of difficulty, in the hour of bereavement, and of our own dissolution, vain are all mere human remedies; vain are the conjectures of probability, and mocking often are the visions of earth, and there is no resource, no stable foundation, but the promise of our Heavenly Father through Jesus Christ, his Son. Then the simple words, 'let not your heart be troubled; trust in God, trust in me also,' 'God is love,' 'God is a Father,'—are worth more than all that philosophy ever conjectured or history taught, or fancy and sentiment devised."—P. 277.

In the present renewed religious excitement, when Catholic and Protestant seem alike in danger of forgetting some important lessons which it might have been thought they had well-nigh mastered, several discourses which appear in the volume assume an unusual importance. We allude to those in which the mutual relations of the disciples of Christ are set forth, and their mutual duties—duties of forbearance, candour and charity—enjoined. As far as the spirit of such lessons might be allowed to penetrate, it would do much, by breathing gently upon them, to still the swelling waters of religious strife, to allure the genial kindness which lies somewhere in the heart of man into active play, and, by passing rapidly and with electric certainty from disciple to disciple, to seal that peace which was one of our Lord's final legacies to his followers. To these and to all the author has appended a noble argument on the religious equality of men—"The Divine in View of the World." It is a just conclusion to the whole series, for it dispels every idea of partiality from the Divine government and providence, and manifests the wide-spreading, universal and equal love of Him who exercises them. It "vindicates the ways of God to man," and indulges in happy anticipations of coming good, of the triumph of a pure and free Christianity, and the mental and moral advancement of the sons of earth. "One God, one Saviour, one religion, one family"—such is the rule of union and of freedom, to the prevalence and the glorious effects of which the eye of Faith is directed with a trusting earnestness. But that the triumph of this rule may be secured, its authority demonstrated, and its happy consequences experienced, a principle which as yet is imperfectly understood in the religious world—a principle, without the recognition of which all anticipations of united Christian advancement are but baseless dreams, and all prophetic descriptions of the future reign of Christ in human hearts magnificent nothings—is strongly and powerfully maintained. That principle is—and oh that the sunbeam would write it upon every human soul!—"Between God and our own souls there shall be no human authority." (P. 301.)

But we are trespassing on the patience of our readers, moved by the earnestness of the author of these Discourses. In giving the volume to the world, he has added to the obligations already conferred by his

numerous publications. And if it were written *currente calamo*, his vivid ideas were but wrought into life at once, instead of being allowed to evaporate by a slower birth. We cordially desire for the volume a wide circulation, which shall at once benefit his readers and indemnify himself. E. W.

THE RISE OF NONCONFORMITY IN BRISTOL.*

The perusal of Mr. Chapman's sound and vigorous discourse, recently addressed to the Lewin's Mead congregation, has revived a long-cherished purpose of putting together a few facts concerning the early history of this important religious society, which the recent researches of members of other churches in that city have brought to light.

No English city partook more freely than Bristol of the religious activity and excitement which preceded and occasioned the downfal of Episcopacy in the seventeenth century. In the reign of James I., the minister of St. Philip's, Mr. Yeamans, impressed upon a large portion of his flock the conscientious, earnest and enthusiastic religious spirit which distinguished the English Puritans. The influence of his pulpit labours was greatly enhanced by the days of fasting and prayer which he kept in the private dwellings of some of his flock. No one of them entered with greater ardour into the lofty spiritualism of their pastor than the wife of a respectable tradesman in High Street, named Kelly. This enthusiastic woman subsequently exercised no slight influence in the city. In the strength of her convictions and the exercise of an intrepidity which no difficulties or dangers could overcome, she was not surpassed by any of the stronger sex. Within two years (1633—1635) she lost both her husband and her pastor. Her afflictions only had the effect of binding her more closely to her religious principles. Scorning mere ritualism as the worst enemy of that living faith which she cherished, she felt it to be a duty to bear her testimony against prevailing superstitions and traditions. In the simple but expressive language of the Broadmead Records,† "She would not observe their invented times and feasts called holy days. She kept a grocer's shop

---

* 1. A Sermon preached before the Lewin's Mead Congregation, Bristol, in aid of the Funds of the Domestic Mission, Sept. 20, 1850. By Edwin Chapman. 12mo. Pp. 24. London—Whitfield.

2. The Rise and Progress of Dissent in Bristol, chiefly in relation to the Broadmead Church. By J. G. Fuller. 12mo. Pp. 379. London—Hamilton. 1840.

3. The Records of a Church of Christ, meeting in Broadmead, Bristol, 1640—1687. Edited for the Hanserd Knollys Society, with an Historical Introduction by Edward Bean Underhill. 8vo. Pp. 526. London. 1847.

† We look upon the very remarkable volume published under this title by the Hanserd Knollys Society as a most valuable contribution to English Nonconformist history. It is the early church book of the highly respectable society of Bristol, now widely known as the church to which Robert Hall devoted the last years of his ministry. The records extend from 1640 to 1687, and are admirably penned by contemporaries of the events described, in a style simple but forcible, full of minute details which set the whole scene described before our eyes.

in High Street, between the Guilder's Inn and the High Cross, where she would keep open her shop in the time they called Christmas-day, and sit sewing in her shop, as a witness for God in the midst of the city, in the face of the sun and the sight of all men; even in those very days of darkness when, as it were, all sorts of people had a reverence of that particular day above all others." (P. 10.) When in her parish church she heard the preacher assert that pictures and images might be used to aid devotion, she rose up and left the church and the preacher in the midst of his sermon. In the time of the civil war, Col. Nathaniel Fiennes (son of Lord Say) was appointed by the Parliament Governor of the city. Gifted with a subtle and cultivated intellect, he had, however, none of the qualities of a soldier. When Prince Rupert impetuously assaulted the city, the citizens and their wives gallantly defended it, and had not the heart of the Governor quailed, the defence would have been successful. For giving up the city to the King's troops, Fiennes was sentenced by a court-martial to die, but pardoned by the Earl of Essex. At his trial the high-spirited woman of whom we have been speaking gave evidence, to the effect that during the siege she had sent into the Castle three months' provision for her family and a great part of her estate, hoping that it would be there preserved and the Castle defended to the last hour, in accordance with the Governor's promises; that when, on the morning of the third day of the siege, the news reached the city that the enemy had been permitted to enter within the line, she, "*with divers other women and maids*," with the help of some men, did with wool-sacks and earth stop up Froome Gate, to keep out the enemy from entering the city, that being the only passage by which they could enter. The women, headed by the intrepid Dorothy, went to the gunners and told them if they would continue the fight they would share the danger with them and bring them a proper supply of provisions. But in the mean time, to their discontent and great grief, the Governor gave up the city, and all was lost.

Incidents like these shew of what materials the Puritans and first Nonconformists of Bristol were fashioned. Before the siege of Bristol she had ceased her widowhood, having, on the earnest entreaty of the church, married as her second husband Mr. Hazard, lecturer of Radcliffe parish, and afterwards minister of St. Ewen's. This Matthew Hazard is the subject of some of Anthony Wood's not measured invective, and is twitted for his submission to the strong will of his wife. Wood describes him as "a main incendiary in the rebellion, violently egged on by his wife, *whose disciple the silly man was*."

It is a charge against Fiennes by Wood, that during his Governorship of the city he encouraged notorious schismatics, amongst whom he names John Tombes, of Leominster, Cradock and Bacon. To these many other eminent Puritan and Nonconformist names may be added. From the time of the persecutions by the Prelates in the reigns of James I. and Charles I., Bristol was much resorted to by fugitive Puritans, as the port whence they sailed to New England. An interesting circumstance is stated in the "Broadmead Records" in connection with this fact. After Mr. Hazard's appointment to the church of St. Ewen's, he did not reside in the parsonage-house, but kept it as a place of refuge for Puritans flying from persecution into exile. Some-

times two or three families at a time were entertained in this manner. The intercourse of these sufferers for conscience' sake with their sympathizing friends in Bristol probably had the effect of strengthening in the minds of the latter their attachment both to religious liberty and Puritan views of religion, and roused an indignant and burning sense of the wrongs inflicted by the Prelates and their agents. The same effect was produced at a later period of the 17th century in the halls of the Presbyterian gentry, who received the persecuted ministers driven by the Five-mile Act from their homes and accustomed places of teaching. What was designed by blind persecutors to crush, in reality gave vigour and new life to Nonconformity. Amongst others, Bristol was visited by John Canne,* a distinguished biblical scholar and one of the deservedly eminent fathers of the English Baptists. From his connection with the Brownists both in England and Holland, this has been sometimes doubted. Crosby hesitated to place him in the list of Baptists, and Bishop Kennett erroneously placed him amongst the Quakers. The "Broadmead Records," however, put it beyond question that in 1640 Canne was a Baptist, or, as the "Records" style him, "a *baptized* man, very eminent in his day for godliness, and for reformation in religion, having great understanding in the way of the Lord." (P. 18.) Mr. Canne's visit to and preaching at Bristol led to the formation of a Baptist church and their separation from the other Puritans of the city. Mrs. Hazard was one of the separatists. Her husband continued to officiate at St. Ewen's until the Act of Uniformity.

In the time of the Commonwealth, Bristol was freely visited by the religious professors of the several sects that then arose. Edwards, in his "Gangræna," makes several allusions to them. From his statement it is clear that, amongst other opinions which he denominates "errors and blasphemies," *Socinianism* had its advocates. "There are two new opinions risen about *Bath* and *Bristoll* among the Anabaptists, and followed with much heat as a glorious discovery of a new light (for so

---

* If for nothing else, John Canne deserves to be held in honourable remembrance for his Bible with marginal notes, published at Amsterdam. Of the first edition the date is unknown; of the second, 1647; and the third, 1664. In his Address to the Reader, he argues that Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture. With its aid, he adds, "there be little need for other interpreters, much less for men to impose their private interpretations and bold glosses upon the text. Did men in their expositions on the Scripture speak less themselves and the Scriptures more, the Scriptures would have more honour and themselves less." Of Canne's history, an interesting but imperfect account is given by Walter Wilson in his Dissenting Churches, IV. 125—136. To Canne belongs the remarkable distinction of having been pastor for a short time of the first Independent or Congregational church in England (that in Deadman's Place, Southwark), and of having been subsequently the founder of some of the early Baptist churches in England. He was also for many years pastor to the ancient English church in Amsterdam. He appears from several of his publications to have been connected with the town of Hull, from which he speaks of himself as having been twice banished, once for a period of seventeen years. In a very rare tract (mentioned only by Mr. Stovel), entitled "Truth with Time," we find this date—"from Hull the beginning of this hopeful year 1656." He probably sailed from and to this town on his voyages between England and Amsterdam. Canne is also entitled to notice as a printer. In this he resembled William Brewster, the Pilgrim, who during the time that the Pilgrim church abode at Leyden followed the honourable employments of printing and teaching.

they call it): it hath been disputed *pro* and *con* in severall conventions, and increaseth much, &c.

"1. That Christe's humane nature is defiled with original sin, as well as ours.

"2. That there is but one person in the Divine nature."—2nd Part, pp. 49, 50.

Further on he gives the substance of a letter from "a great sectary" residing in the West, about Bath and those parts. "Oh, methinks how ignorant to this day is the world of the end of Christ's coming! which makes them so dark in the understanding what Christ is: people look upon him so to be God, as not at all to be man; whereas I am of the minde he was very man of the same nature with us: for otherwise it would be no encouragement to us to go to the Father upon the same ground that Christ is entered, if he was of a more holier nature then us; but in this appears God's love to us, that he would take one of us in the same condition, to convince us of what he is to us, and hath made us to be in him, &c."* (P. 58.) That the "new light" found favour at Bristol is strongly stated thus:—"I have been told, from a good hand, of a letter lately written from Bristol from a very godly man that lives there, and is well known to be so, to a godly minister in this city of *London* that hath some relation to *Bristol*, the contents whereof are as follows: That here at Bristol none of the townsmen or countrey are taken in to be imployed in any service, or put into any place, or lookt upon with any respect, that are godly, unless they be men of the new light and new way, but malignants are rather preferred before them; and if things go on thus, I will leave the kingdom, or words to that effect."—Pp. 91, 92.

Amongst the "sectaries" who resorted to Bristol, Edwards names Bacon and Symonds; the former was one of the original Baptist separatists. He appears to have settled with a religious society at Gloucester, but to have been expelled thence "for several erroneous doctrines," and to have taken refuge in London. But subsequently to the taking of the city of Bristol by the Parliamentary forces, he returned there. Mr. Symonds, like William Erbury, was one of "the reforming ministers of South Wales," who frequently visited Bristol. Symonds had advanced to that great truth, gained only by the few master-minds of the age, and which sounded strange and most offensive in the ears of both Episcopalians and Presbyterians, that all men are entitled to worship God, without let and hindrance, according to the light of their own consciences. Another man who exercised spiritual influence in Bristol was Mr. Walter Cradock, appointed in 1646 itinerant preacher

* This reminds us very much of the opinions and style of an early Unitarian, whose writings have been strangely neglected, William Erbery or Erbury. He was in frequent communication with the Baptists and others in Bristol and South Wales. Walter Cradock, once his curate at Cardiff, was an occasional preacher at Bristol. Heath, in his Flagallum, gives his recollections of a sermon which he had heard Erbury preach "in a public congregation near Bath." The most remarkable statement given by Heath is, that Erbury declared that "under the gospel God was discovered to be a Father full of light and love; so that now we converse with God in a loving manner, and serve him as a son serveth his father." Of Erbury's "Testimony," which is a very rare book, we possess a copy, and from it and other sources propose to draw up for a future No. of our Magazine some account of this reviled but we believe most estimable man.

of the gospel in Wales. He, too, was the preacher of the strange doctrine of full liberty of conscience, that no man should be punishable for matter of opinion, and that there should be no confessions of faith.

Amongst the early preachers in Bristol must not be passed over the names of Mr. Wroth and Mr. Henry Jessey. Mr. Wroth was educated at Oxford, and afterwards settled in the parish of Llanvaches, in Monmouthshire. So powerful and effectual was his preaching, and so exemplary was the holiness of his life, that he was styled the "Apostle of Wales." Of Mr. Jessey we gave some account in a former volume (Bunhill Memorials, V. 710—712). He was sent into Wales in Nov. 1639, by his congregation, to assist old Mr. Wroth, Mr. Cradock and others. He afterwards frequently visited the churches in Bristol and the West. His spirit was beautifully catholic, his biblical knowledge was profound, and his philanthropy was truly Christian.

Of the seven ejected Bristol ministers mentioned by Calamy, one stands pre-eminent in all the qualities that adorn the Christian confessor—John Knowles. He was probably only engaged as a lecturer at the cathedral, as we are informed that his name does not appear in the lists of regularly appointed clergy in connection with the cathedral. He came to Bristol in the maturity of his years and powers, with liberal and enlarged views, and his pure and holy zeal as a Christian pastor and teacher was guided by an intimate knowledge of human nature gathered in the course of an eventful pilgrimage. At the University of Cambridge he gained both learning and piety, having Mr. Richard Vines as his chamber-fellow at Magdalen Hall. He became Fellow of Katherine Hall, where his labours as a tutor were held in high esteem. Invited by the corporation of Colchester, he undertook a lectureship in that town. His residence in Essex procured for him the friendship of Mr. John Rogers, of Dedham, a man often honourably mentioned in the Puritan biographies of that age. Driven from England by the ruthless persecution of Archbishop Laud, he crossed the Atlantic, and for more than ten years ministered to some of the newly-formed churches in the wildernesses of America. Somewhere about 1650, he returned to England. Whether he were the same John Knowles who had once been connected with Gloucester, and in 1650, on returning from America, settled for a time as preacher to the garrison at Chester, and became obnoxious to Samuel Eaton for his heretical opinions on the Trinity; or whether there were two persons bearing the name of Knowles, each of whom had spent a part of his life in America, and returned to his native land about the same time, is a point on which we will not at present venture an opinion, but prefer waiting for further light. Certain, however, it is, that John Knowles who preached for some years at the cathedral in Bristol, was a man of enlarged views and high religious courage. He resisted with equal decision the ritual impositions of the Prelates in England, and the narrow bigotry of the Pilgrim churches in America. During his ministry at Bristol, his patience and fidelity to religious liberty were sorely tried by the Quakers, whose coarse and fanatical bigotry impelled them to rush with indecent violence into the churches at the hour of public service, and with gross insults to disturb the worship of congregations assembled in "steeple-houses," and their "priests." Little discrimination was shewn by these enthusiasts in the selection of the objects of attack.

A pious and devoted minister of Christ was treated by them with equal contumely with a semi-popish priest or a wanton persecutor. Mr. Knowles and Mr. Ewins, of All-Saints church, Bristol (and afterwards a Bartholomean confessor and pastor of the Broadmead church), were more than once troubled by the Quakers. The former probably bore the wrong with patience; against Mr. Ewins it was a charge (a similar charge is a stain on the memory of Dr. Owen) that he caused one Sarah Latchett, once a member of the Baptist church, to be sent to Bridewell, and there to be whipped, "for testifying in their meeting," 2nd day, 9th month, 1655.

Driven from Bristol, John Knowles sought to exercise in London the ministry to which he was indissolubly bound. When that guilty city was desolated by the plague, and the hireling priests who had been thrust into the pulpits vacated by the ejected ministers, fled into the country and left their flocks to perish untended, Knowles administered the consolations of religion by the bed-side of the dying, and visited rich and poor alike on this errand of mercy. Whether he, like other ejected ministers, was at this season of spiritual destitution permitted to enter any of the vacant pulpits of the metropolis, and minister to the mourning and awe-struck survivors of the pestilence, is not recorded. When committed to prison for his Nonconformity, he fearlessly followed his vocation as a preacher of righteousness to his fellow-prisoners, esteeming it preferable to do this than to live an useless though secure life in his own house.

It may from this slight glance at the life and character of John Knowles, be well believed that his ministry at Bristol was not unproductive of deep and enduring spiritual impressions. Though he himself was inclined rather to the Independent than to the Presbyterian form, we may conjecture that his fine catholic spirit had gathered around him disciples of more than one creed, and that amongst his hearers who mourned his ejection on the Restoration, were some of the first founders of both the Presbyterian and the Independent Nonconformist churches of Bristol.

It is a peculiar feature in the religious history of Bristol, that, with the exception of Mr. Ewins, those who had sown the seeds of Nonconformity in that city were not privileged to witness and to tend the growth, amidst showers and storms, of the vigorous plant. Immediately after the first storm of persecution following the Act of Uniformity had begun to subside, we find six distinct Nonconformist societies formed in Bristol—three of them Baptist, two Independent, and one Presbyterian. This fact shews the inaccuracy of Mr. Seyer's statement, in his "Memoirs of Bristol," that the *Presbyterians* had gained the supremacy, and that most of the churches were occupied by their ministers.

In what remains of this sketch, we shall chiefly confine our attention to the early history of the society whose descendants now worship at the chapel in Lewin's Mead. The honour of forming this society is assigned by Mr. Murch to Mr. John Weeks, ejected from Buckland Newton, in Dorsetshire; Mr. William Troughton, from Salisbury; Mr. Richard Fairclough, from Wells, in Somersetshire; and Mr. Samuel Winney, from Glastonbury. With respect to one of these names, the accuracy of the statement appears questionable. Mr. Troughton is men-

tioned in the Broadmead Records as an Independent. His congregation is described as small, consisting of about twenty members, meeting in no fixed place,—"sometimes one where and sometimes another, having some honourable women of note amongst them, but few men."

Of the six Nonconformist societies which comprised the earliest Protestant Dissent of Bristol, that of which John Weeks was the pastor was in all respects the most important. It numbered 1500 members, many of them men of high commercial standing in the city. It is a remarkable fact that no record belonging to the Lewin's Mead society, no tradition lingering amongst the descendants of the first Presbyterian Nonconformists, has preserved the knowledge of the site of the first place of their meeting. Mr. Murch says, "It does not appear in what place the members of the Weeks' congregation assembled during the troublesome times which preceded the Revolution;" and in his recent sermon, Mr. Chapman states that "it does not even appear that it had any fixed place of meeting until after the Revolution."

From the Broadmead Records we learn that the first place of worship was "a public place, whereto the people did resort, as common as to the public places called churches;" and further, that it was situated in St. James's Back. At first the members probably met in private dwellings, perhaps that of the pastor or some principal member. When, after nearly ten years of persecution, the Act of Indulgence enabled the Dissenters to meet together more openly, Mr. Weeks's people took out a licence, dated March 15, 167$\frac{1}{2}$, *in a room or roomes in the house of John Loyde, lying in St. James Backes, Bristoll.**

"There is a well-founded tradition," says Mr. Chapman, "that in gathering together for their earnest worship, under the ban of both law and social opinion, they went by ones and twos, stopping at the entrances of mean places and narrow passages before entering, and looking cautiously right and left to see if they were observed by enemies or informers. The first meeting-house was reached through a small alley under other houses, which protected it from inconvenient observation."

It was a great misfortune to Bristol generally, but especially to the Nonconformists, that on the death of Gilbert Ironside, Guy Carleton was appointed Bishop. He was a man of strong passions, and had many wrongs to revenge. In the Commonwealth times, he was ejected from a rich living in the north of England, and afterwards he was dispossessed by the Tryers of some preferment he had obtained in Berkshire. When the Civil War broke out, he sided with the King, to whom he rendered valuable military service, being an able horseman. Just before the Restoration, he fell into trouble, and, being imprisoned at Lambeth Palace, was sentenced to death. He contrived, however, to escape, and proceeded to Holland, and presented himself before Charles.

* This is stated by Mr. Fuller in his "Rise and Progress of Dissent in Bristol," which is, however, chiefly an abstract of the Broadmead Records, and gives little information respecting the Lewin's Mead society. Mr. Fuller states that the church in Bridge Street, formerly meeting in Tucker Street, was a branch of the church which first met at St. James's Back, and ultimately built a chapel in Lewin's Mead. We shall be gratified if this article induce some friend resident in Bristol to ascertain, and to publish in our columns, if the records of the Bridge Street church contain any particulars of the parent society.

He was appointed to the see of Bristol in 1671, and, although restrained for a time by the Royal Indulgence, speedily shewed his animosity against the Nonconformists. He is styled in the Broadmead Records the *Goliath of the Philistines*. In a contemporary Nonconformist pamphlet his doings are thus recorded: "He hardly missed a day, but was ever on the Tolzey with the justices, and seated himself next the Mayor, where he was very liberal of his threats. He began with a counsellor-at-law, whom he threatened for pleading the King's licences, before they were recalled; and afterwards inveighed against him, in his sermon at the College, as one who would plead the devil's cause for a piece of money. * * * The Bishop was pleased to bring with him some of the meanest of his clergy, both for abilities and interest, to inform against the Dissenters; but the more judicious, learned and able divines peremptorily refusing that hated employ, for which his Lordship, in a visitation speech, severely lashed them. The Bishop, to encourage others, then assumes the title of informer."* He found a willing agent of persecution in one John Hellier, an attorney and a native of Bristol. He was infamous in his personal character, but contrived to thrive in his profession, having scraped together an estate of £200 per annum. It was the misfortune of the three Nonconformist churches who were accustomed to meet in St. James's parish, that this man was armed with official power, being appointed, in the year 1674, churchwarden.

Mr. Weeks, together with the minister of Broadmead and Mr. Gifford, were summoned before the Council for attending conventicles. The congregations would not allow the ministers to appear, but feed counsellors, and by them pleaded their right to meet. The four principal congregations ("two Baptized, one Presbyterian and one Independent"), as soon as they began to be troubled, resolved "to join together and unite in counsel and charge, as poor sheep driven together by wolves; and resolved to endeavour what they could to defend themselves by law against those vile persecutors that were risen up against their peaceable and quiet meetings, resolving to destroy us. In order thereto, these four churches chose two men of each congregation to act for the whole; and these eight men took care of the matters of law, to follow it."† (P. 218.) Hellier broke down in his evidence on this first charge, falsely swearing that upon Sept. 27, 1674, Andrew Gifford had preached at a certain place, whereas the preacher of that day happened to be Charles Harford. Being confronted by the opposing oaths of four persons present on the occasion, the magistrates were compelled to dismiss the case. Irritated by the opposition he met with in the courts, Bishop Carleton proceeded to London and stated the case

---

* "A Sober Answer," &c., pp. 16, 19.

† Persecution brought both Presbyterians and Baptists into a better spirit. Seventeen years earlier, both churches were at variance. "As *(to)* our friends called Presbyterians, those of them that were bitter-spirited or rigid, they would vilify our ministry and their call, saying they were not true ministers, because not called and ordained in their way by a classical or synodical assembly, and not brought up at the university for such literature. And because we met in houses divers times in the week days, for the church meeting, &c., these things they did not then understand or less practise, therefore they spake evil of us as seducers."—Records, pp. 56, 57.

to the King. In Feb. 1675, the licences were, to the joy of Carleton and his followers, revoked. The work of persecution immediately began: three of the ministers of the city were seized in the midst of their flocks and sent to prison. "When Sheriff Fielding, about ten o'clock at night, had brought them to the prison door, he deridingly bid Mr. Weeks take his leave of his holy brethren." (P. 222.)

The pastorless flocks forsook not the assembling of themselves together. If there were no gifted brother equal to the duty of the sermon, they could at least find amongst their own number persons able to conduct the devotional services of the church and to read a chapter or two, and the whole congregation united in the fervent song of praise. We can scarcely imagine anything more impressive and affecting than the simple religious rites of these faithful men and women. As the deacons or elders read the Scriptures suitable to their circumstances,—of the afflictions of the righteous, of the holy courage of Daniel and Paul, of the sufferings of the Saviour,—the attentive flock applied all to their imprisoned pastors, and in their own souls meditated on faith and hope with an earnestness deeper than that which any preacher's exhortations could inspire. Before the Presbyterians of St. James's Back could make up their minds to accept the services of men unordained and untaught at an university, they had to struggle with and conquer long-cherished prejudices. It was the plan of Providence to fit them by their trials for a great work, and they were enlightened and purified by those lessons of wisdom and holiness which are best taught in the school of affliction. The persecutors were disappointed and irritated by the continuance of the Nonconformist assemblies. They hoped, having taken away the heads, the bodies would fall to the ground. The peace of the Sabbath-day was violated by the coarse brutality of Hellier, who with an energy worthy of a better cause continued to harry the "Conventiclers." On the Sunday following that on which Mr. Weeks was arrested, many of the congregation were seized and thrown into Newgate, the city prison. The persecuted flocks began to devise various schemes to protect themselves from their enemies. One door of the meeting-house was used for ingress; the other, reserved for egress, was kept fast until required to be open. Youths were stationed outside the building to give notice of the approach of the churchwarden and his train. "Women and sisters" (such was the courage of Puritan women) "would sit and crowd in the stairs, when we did begin the meeting with any exercise, that so the informers might not too suddenly come in upon us; by reason of which they were prevented divers times." (Records, p. 223.)

As the person preaching or conducting the service was in peculiar danger, various means were devised for his safety. At Broadmead they invented a trap-door, constructed like a buffet, against the wall, in one of the seats. On the approach of the informers the minister was hastily conveyed away through the opening into a room below. A portion of the meeting-house around the pulpit was closed in with a thick curtain. Within the curtain no strangers were allowed to enter, so that informers, though they might hear, could not see the preacher. When the informers and officers entered, the congregation immediately with one consent began to sing a psalm, previously announced in anticipation of such unwelcome visitors. The officers knowing not on

whom to fix, after taking down the names of some, would appear to retire. The sermon would then proceed, but be again interrupted by the return of the officers, who, however, as before, found the congregation singing. Sometimes this would occur thrice in the course of a single service. At St. James's Back, Mr. Weeks's people, instead of a curtain, put a wainscot board in a convenient place in the meeting-house, behind which the preacher stood out of sight, but within the hearing of the congregation. None but known friends were permitted to come within the pale. "So when the informers came, they had the convenience to convey him that spake out of that part of the meeting into another house."

Within a few weeks a fourth minister was added to the three previously confined in the city prison. The sufferings of the Nonconformists in the crowded jail were severe. They are described in a pamphlet of the day. They were crowded together, being sometimes convicted in gangs of not less than forty or fifty, in "one of the worst places in Newgate, where was a low, damp, earthen floor." They were denied the light of a candle and other necessaries and comforts. The common prisoners felt compassion for their innocent companions, and would sometimes lend them a candle to enable them to read their Bibles. The keeper's vigilance generally deprived them of this indulgence, and his resentment exposed them to increased sufferings, being denied beds and even straw to lie upon, or a form on which to rest their wearied limbs. But what the jailor denied was sometimes supplied to them by the other prisoners. To all these troubled men Mr. John Weeks was a pastor, friend, and most tender comforter. Dr. Calamy says of him, that "his spirits were elevated by the zeal of his enemies; the thought of his persecutors would revive him, if he was dejected and dispirited before." Not only did he preach to his fellow-prisoners, but from a window in the jail often addressed crowds of people without, amongst whom were doubtless assembled many of those who had long benefited by his instructions, and now eagerly desired to see his face.

But a more solemn duty than preaching was soon required of him. The first minister committed to prison was Mr. John Thompson, the pastor of the Independent congregation at the Castle. He was ill at the time of his committal, and, being of a corpulent frame, the confinement and the foul air of a crowded prison aggravated his sickness. Much interest was made for him by some leading men in the city, and Dr. Ichabod Chauncey (also an ejected minister), his physician, represented the urgency of his state; but Sir John Knight, Ollive, the Mayor, and other city authorities, *at the instigation of the Bishop*, hardened their hearts, and would not relax the severity of his confinement. He grew rapidly worse, and amidst the tears and sobs of many of his fellow-prisoners, but his own heart stayed by the conviction that his hour of release was come, and that he was about to pass from death to life, while Mr. Weeks's voice was uttering the solemn words of prayer and Christian resignation, his spirit passed on to that blessed rest where *the wicked cease from troubling*. His funeral was necessarily a hurried one. On the very day (March 5, 1674-5) following his death he was carried from his prison to his grave. But his burial was not unhonoured. The news of his death ran swiftly through the city; on

the morrow all the Dissenters (except the Quakers) met in silence and sorrow, but with a stern resolution marked in their countenances; and when the doors of Newgate opened, they formed into a procession of not less than 5000 persons, and followed the corpse of this Nonconformist martyr to St. Philips'. A similar demonstration was made in London on occasion of the death of Mr. Jenkyns, at Bunhill Fields. It was calculated to strike terror into the hearts of the Prelates and their agents to see the numbers and courage of the persecuted Nonconformists, and to make them think that a day of reckoning might be at hand.

The year 1675 opened gloomily for the congregation at St. James's Back. On the first Sunday thereof,* "the Mayor, with some aldermen, serjeants and informers, were busy at Mr. Weeks's meeting." (Records, p. 233.) The zeal and mutual friendliness of the four pastorless flocks increased through outward persecutions. In addition to their Sunday services, meetings were held in common by the four societies in private houses for religious exercises, one every evening except Saturday, beginning about five o'clock and continuing two hours. The tracking of these "conventicles" made the informers very busy, and the consequent informations and proceedings were frequent and wearisome. The appetite of the magistrates for persecution was dulled. Some of them complained that "they could do little else at the Tolzey but matters about meetings." One day in each week was fixed for this business, and by this arrangement the churches gained a little temporary ease. As difficulties were thrown in the way of punishing Dissenters, Hellier devised a plan of preventing their worship. The watchful Nonconformists stole a march upon him, and filled their meeting-house before he reached the place. The Broadmead people, to secure a second service, stayed in the meeting during the usual hour of dinner. Mr. Weeks's people were less provident; "they going all home, they kept them out in the afternoon, *and Hellier dined in their place;* and they (the officers) threw their chairs and stools out in the street, and some in the river at James's Back." Some of the congregation meeting in front of the house, were apprehended and charged with a riot. On the following Sunday, the Presbyterians adopted the plan of the Baptists, and remained in their meeting-house until the close of the second service. "Then the Mayor sent for two of the chiefest of them, viz. Mr. Chrismas and Mr. Thompson, the merchant, before him; and after reasoning with them, threatened them that he would come down to the meeting in the afternoon. They told the Mayor, *If he did, he should find them there, in the path of their duty, waiting upon the Lord.*" (Records, p. 239.)

Mr. Weeks and three other of the Bristol prisoners were by writ of Habeas Corpus removed to London, and the question of the legality of their commitment was argued in the Court of King's Bench.† By the false evidence (so it is alleged in the "Records") of Ralph Ollive, the

* March 28. The year previous to the New Style began on March 25th. January and February were then reckoned the eleventh and twelfth months.

† These legal proceedings cost about £500. This sum was provided by a rate levied on the four congregations according to their supposed ability. The liability, divided into forty shares, was thus apportioned—Presbyterians, 16; Independents, 10; two Baptist, 14.

Mayor's son, the case of the prisoners failed; but the Judges gave an order that the Sheriffs should provide a better prison for them.

On June 15, 1675, the day of the trial at Westminster, the four congregations met to celebrate a special service, and to pray for the two ministers and the others on their trial. This union led to a proposal for closer union, and a committee was appointed to arrange the method of it. Of Mr. Weeks's congregation there were selected the aforesaid Mr. Thompson, Mr. Doleman and Mr. Chock, and afterwards Mr. Pope and Mr. Tucker. But the proposed union was prevented by some scruples on the part of the congregation at St. James's Back. These related, 1stly, to their desire to pray for magistrates, according to the Scriptures, whether good or bad; 2ndly, to their readiness to sing psalms with others besides the church; 3rdly, to their anxiety for properly ordained preachers; and 4thly, to their fear lest the Baptists should avail themselves of the union to convert the others to their doctrine.

Mr. Weeks returned to his prison at Bristol, June 5, 1675. On the following morning, Hellier, "that wretched man," was busy at St. James's Back. "He, with the constables, stayed there, mocking and striking some, pulling and hauling others; and so both morning and afternoon he was there, and hindered them that they could not preach, but sing, pray and read chapters." (Records, p. 244.)

The question of union being again discussed, it was agreed, 1, that the four congregations should join in a quarterly prayer-meeting and fast-day; 2, that they should have other occasional meetings for fasting and prayer; and, "3 and lastly, it was agreed concerning the ordering of ourselves in our meetings in this day of trouble, that none stir from this meeting when the informers or any officers come whatsoever. And if the Mayor himself come, that we move or depart but very slowly, when forced, if he doth much insist on it, and command our departure." (P. 246.)

Mr. Weeks and Mr. Hardcastle were set at liberty August 2, 1675. The latter immediately resumed his public ministry at Broadmead, and was again imprisoned. For a short time Mr. Weeks went out of town, but then resumed his duties, notwithstanding almost constant interruptions and alarms. Hellier, towards the close of the year, intimated to Mr. Weeks's people, through one of their number, John Tucker, that if they would abstain from assembling during the hours of public service at the churches, he would not interfere with them. They accordingly made a fresh arrangement of the hours of service, meeting in the morning at 11, and in the afternoon at 3. This concession or compromise was regarded with great disapprobation by the other congregations, and the expression of the feeling on their part led to an alienation and to the breaking up of the quarterly union, so far as the St. James's Back congregation were concerned. Hellier did not long keep his promise, for before the year was ended the congregation was again disturbed.

The year 1676 and four following years were for the most part peaceful. In 1681 began, according to the Broadmead Records, the tenth persecution, and the Presbyterians were the victims of some gross outrages on both liberty and property.

"On the same day" (Tuesday, Dec. 13, 1681, a monthly day of

prayer), "John Hellier, who came from London the night before, Captain Edward Arundell and his lieutenant, and many constables of James's ward, &c., went before four and five in the evening to Mr. Weeks's, the Presbyterian minister's meeting-house, in James's Back; and there, after many people were come in, expecting to hear a lecture-sermon, as usual at that time, Hellier and his company commanded them to depart; and then ordered a smith, and several other labourers he had provided, to pull down the pulpit, which he called the prattling-box, and the pews; and they broke and tore them all to pieces as fast as they could. As this was doing, much rabble and boys came in, and Hellier encouraged them to help, and said he would send up their names to the King, and they should have £20 a-piece. So about fourteen labourers and the rabble continued late at night, breaking down the galleries, and tore their very windows in pieces; and the rabble carried away the plunder as fast as they could, so that an hundred pounds would not make it good again.

"The next day, Walter Watkins broke open the door of the house that goes into Mr. Weeks's meeting, and fetched out the broken stuff and timber plucked down, and had it hauled away to Bridewell."

In the same way one of the Baptist meeting-houses and that of the Quakers were treated. To this outrage was added the insult of valuing the property carried away from Mr. Weeks's at twenty-two shillings, the Quakers' at fifteen shillings, and Mr. Gifford's at twelve shillings and sixpence. The damage really done was estimated at £200. The pretended justification of this violence and plunder was a warrant from the King's deputy-lieutenants to make a distress for five pounds, for not sending a soldier to the muster under Lord Herbert.

On the 12th of March, 168½, Mr. Weeks was arrested before the afternoon meeting, in St. James's churchyard, by his old enemy, Hellier. He was taken before the Mayor, who, with that capricious tyranny which marked the times, insisted on Mr. Weeks accompanying him to St. Werburgh's church. At the following sessions he was committed to prison for a violation of the Five-mile Act. The accusation against him was of having been with the Baptists on the Downs,—according to the "Records," a false charge. He was removed to London on a writ of Habeas Corpus, and there succeeded in obtaining his discharge.

The persecution now became so hot, and the penalties of the several Acts passed to crush the Nonconformists were so severe, that there was no longer any possibility of continuing their assemblies in their accustomed meeting-houses. But the several flocks gathered together, sometimes on the Downs, sometimes in a wood, sometimes by the river side. The statute of the 23rd of Elizabeth was now raked up for the destruction of the Nonconformists, and not less than 150 of them were convicted by the Recorder, and fined £20 a month, for not coming to church. It is scarcely to be wondered at that some of Mr. Weeks's people could not endure the fiery ordeal, and conformed. In the following year, the fury of Hellier, now Under-Sheriff for Somersetshire, and his crew, led to a very tragical occurrence. Mr. Weeks's people had assembled for worship, on an afternoon in April, on the banks of the river Avon. Hellier came upon them, and many of them escaped over the water. Anticipating this, Hellier had posted Ollive and others on the Gloucestershire side of the river. Waving his hat to them as a

signal to begin the pursuit of the fugitives, Mr. Knight, a minister of Taunton, and Mr. Ford, a mercer of High Street, were selected and chased about half a mile. Wearied and closely pursued, both sought to escape by re-crossing the river. Their enemies were on the bank uttering cries—"Knock them down!"—so wild that persons at a distance thought they were hunting a deer, and the cattle in the neighbouring meadows ran wildly about. Mr. Ford, who first entered the stream, finding himself in deep water and sinking, cried out for help. But his pursuers were men that knew not what mercy or generosity was. Ollive and his companions saw him sink, and then withdrew. On the other side, a poor collier, with a child in his arms, saw the danger of the minister, and, placing the infant on the grass, rushed into the water. He had much difficulty in saving Mr. Knight and bringing him to shore. His appeal to Watkins, the marshal, to aid him, was refused. But the honest colliers came to his help, and, carrying the almost drowned and utterly exhausted man to the house of Mr. Fox, in Pill Marsh, he was put into a warm bed and restored. It sounds almost incredible that the officers who had hunted Mr. Ford to his death, should dare to come to the house and demand that Mr. Knight should be given up to them, that they might carry him to prison. To shield themselves, they raised the false cry that he had killed Mr. Ford. Others said that Mr. Ford had drowned himself. The Coroner's jury impannelled to inquire into the cause of his death, brought a verdict, that one of the officers as principal, and two others (one of whom was Watkins) as accessories, were the cause of Mr. Ford's death. But so wickedly corrupt was the administration of the law at this time, that the prosecution entirely failed, notwithstanding the honest endeavours of the Coroner to bring the guilty men to punishment.

Mr. Weeks for a time gave up the active discharge of his ministry in Bristol and the neighbourhood, and his people resorted very much to hear a Mr. Young, who had been the parish minister of Brislington, but had latterly thrown in his lot with the Nonconformists. But he and many of the flock were seized and committed to the jail at Gloucester. The work of persecution seemed to be successful; for now, except the Baptists, whom nothing succeeded in intimidating, all the Dissenting congregations in the city for a time suspended their meetings. The Baptist prisoners were treated with great severity, and Mr. Fownes, the Broadmead pastor,* after an imprisonment of two years and nine months in Gloucester jail, was released by death, November 29, 1685.

The darkest hour of the night is that which just precedes the dawn of day. The sufferings of the Bristol Nonconformists were coming to a close. First they got relief through the dishonest policy of James II. In 1686, the churches began to re-assemble. In 1687, after being scattered above five years, the Baptists, and probably their neighbours the Presbyterians, returned to their old meeting-houses. In 1688, the glorious Revolution was effected. The Toleration Act followed. In 1692, the records of the Lewin's Mead congregation begin, and the interesting and able summary of the subsequent history of the society

* An ancestor of Mr. Fownes, who was in the last century a Presbyterian minister at Shrewsbury.

given by Mr. Murch in his "History of the Presbyterian Churches in the West of England," precludes the necessity of further details.

Not to all the Bartholomean confessors was the privilege granted of surviving the quarter of a century of persecution which followed their withdrawment from a corrupt and tyrannical Church. It is pleasant to think of the feelings with which John Weeks surveyed the structure raised soon after the Revolution by the piety and munificence of his flock. He lived until 1698, and the place of worship reared for him, and the building which now stands on the same site,* have from that day to this been consecrated to religious liberty and Christian charity.

THE BIBLE, THE KORAN, AND THE VEDAS.

At a late anniversary of an Unitarian society, the Hon. Edward Everett, late President of Harford University, said,—"I have several times in my life attempted to read the Koran. I have done so lately. I have approached it with a highly-excited literary curiosity. I have felt a strong desire to penetrate this great mystery of the Arabian desert. As I have in some Turkish town (for in the provincial Turkish towns there is little of the bustle of our Western life), listened, at the close of the day, to the clear, calm voice of the muezzin, from the top of the graceful minaret, calling the faithful to evening prayer,—as I have mused on the vicissitudes of all human things, beneath the venerable dome of St. Sophia,—I have, I may say, longed to find some rational ground of sympathy between Christianity and Islamism; but anything more repulsive and uninviting than the Koran I have seldom attempted to peruse, even when taken up with these kindly feelings. And yet you are well aware that it is not conceived in a spirit of hostility towards the Old and New Testament, but recognizes them both as a divine revelation. With such portions of the sacred books of the Hindoos as have fallen in my way, the case is far worse. The mythological system contained in them is a tissue of monstrosities and absurdities, by turns so revolting and nauseous as to defy perusal, except from some strong motive of duty, or of literary curiosity, which would prompt the investigation. I really believe that few things would do more to raise the Scriptures in our estimation, than to compare the Bible with the Koran and the Vedas. It is not a course of reading to be generally recommended. The books are scarce, and, as I have said, their contents eminently repulsive; but I will venture to say to those whose professional duty it is to maintain the sacred character of the Christian Scriptures, that I know of scarce any line of reading which might be taken up with greater advantage, for the purpose of fair comparison, than that of the sacred books, as they are called, of the Mahometans and Hindoos."

---

* Mr. Chapman alludes to the circumstance that the successors of Mr. Weeks lamented that they were constrained to build the second chapel in Lewin's Mead, the character of which had in the course of a century undergone a very extraordinary revolution, being no longer the abode of the rich and their splendours, but of the "poor and their miseries, the wicked and their crimes and vices." The use which Mr. Chapman makes of this circumstance is ingenious. We wish we had room for his remarks, which are both true and eloquent.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Unitarian Sermons on the "Papal Aggression."

So many of our ministers have published sermons occasioned by the popular movement against the Pope's Bull, and they so much in tone and spirit, if not in argument, resemble one another, that we can do little more than give a passing glance at each. The circumstances have led the preachers generally to a comparison between the two Churches of Rome and England, and to contrast with both of them the freer Churches of Unitarians.

Mr. Boucher, in his earnest and occasionally eloquent sermon to the Gravel-Pit congregation, which he entitles "The Present Religious Crisis," pronounces the controversy about episcopal titles, now so fiercely waged between the two Churches, "a frivolous dispute." He argues that Rome must earn its success in England before it can enjoy it. The Pope may make the first step, "but the people of England must *invite* the second." If, by every manifestation of the religious life, by self-denial, humility, persevering labour, affectionate care, by readiness to assist and counsel the needy and perplexed, Romish priests can persuade the people of England to leave the national and richly-endowed Church to pass into that of Rome, they will be entitled to enjoy their triumph. But Mr. Boucher anticipates no such result, and places his confidence, not in the energy or wisdom of the Anglican clergy, who, corrupted by Puseyism, go into the battle with faint hearts and crippled limbs, but to the sound sense and the instinctive love of liberty which characterize the English nation. The following is a fine passage:

"I place little reliance on the power of the Anglican Church, as now constituted, to stem the tide of Romanism; yet am I devoid of fear. Whatever present appearances may seem to say, Romanism as the Universal Church has fallen and for ever. It had a field such as no other Church ever had. It ruled high and low, from the emperor to the slave. It spread over all lands, and drew the materials of its power from the most distant regions. To every relation and condition of life it attached itself; from the cradle to the grave it surrounded men with its influences, and was free to mould them to its will. Art was in its service; learning it directed; books it alone circulated. It could paralyze a nation by its interdict; it could consign the heretic to the rack, the scaffold, or the stake. It has been tried as fairly and fully as its loudest advocates could ask; every advantage of the world has been on its side. Yet it has failed. Human nature has said No! to its claims of universality and perpetuity. God's providence has emphatically said No! It has been weighed and found wanting." P. 18.

Mr. Thom entitles his very able sermon, "Ecclesiastical Pretensions, Romish and English, with the Antidote which a Catholic Protestantism supplies." He argues stoutly for the right of the Catholic Church to make its own arrangements and to give its own titles in England, as in Ireland and other countries. When he proceeds to argue that the new arrangement does not increase the power of the Romish Bishop, he says that for which the authority of Cardinal Wiseman and others may, we know, be alleged, but which, nevertheless, we must be permitted to question. We have greatly misunderstood the character of the Romish system,—the mightiest scheme for enthralling the human spirit and crushing liberty that a corrupt ambition ever devised,—if it allows any one of its Bishops, whether he take the title of his see from a town in Spain or England, to cease to be "a lieutenant of the Pope," or to be irremovable at the Pope's pleasure. If there were no motive and no prospect of an increase of power, the Roman Pontiff would never have issued his recent Letters Apostolical from the Flaminian Gate. Deluded by the conversions of a few score of clergymen and their relatives, whose Protestantism had been debauched by Oxford Puseyism, into the belief that large masses of the English people were ripe for conversion, the Pope thought to hasten the process by creating a

number of English sees, as a reward for the sacrifices made by men of talent and rank in quitting the richly-endowed Church of England for the comparatively poor Church of Rome. Towards the Church of England Mr. Thom exercises little tenderness, and we think she deserves none:

"The Church of England was from the beginning a system of compromise: and she has ever since, with such results of peace as might be expected, been holding irreconcilable principles in the same bosom. She satisfied the Reformers by her Creeds and Articles; and she soothed the prejudices of those who still clung to any relics of the older Church, by leaving them in substantial possession of their ancient Liturgies. The Articles which her Ministers sign once, but never speak, are Protestant: all the Creeds introduced into her daily worship are older than the Reformation, and belong to Rome; and all the ceremonies, habits, prayers, and spoken forms, by which she expresses her spirit before the people, are of Roman quality and origin. They are, almost without exception, translations from the Latin of the Romish Church into the richer and more devout language of England. She is Calvinistic in her Creed, but Sacerdotal in her Service. Salvation by faith is the doctrine of her Articles: and salvation by Sacraments is the teaching of her Prayer-Book."—Pp. 15, 16.

Mr. Thom does not allow the so-called Evangelical party to escape without censure:

"The alarm and indignation of the Evangelical party is more purely on Doctrinal grounds. But they have had a large share in producing the present condition of things. By their coarse preaching of the doctrine of the Atonement, in its most revolting forms, they drove more clear and fastidious minds to seek a veil for its offensiveness under sacrament and symbol, and in words to treat it with 'reserve,' and so they helped to form the Sacerdotal party. By their fanatical violence against Popery when it was obscure and weak, they preached it into notice; and made it interesting, perhaps too interesting, as persecuted, to generous minds. They will now, no doubt, cite its present pretensions in proof of the wisdom of their former warnings; but not so—they have blown this coal, they have raised the spirit they trampled and denounced, as when one beats a fire. They, too, preach Salvation by Doctrine, which requires an infallible guidance to secure that we have found the saving Truth; and so in principle they side with Rome, and put forth claims to Infallibility, or else they make Salvation depend on a condition which they cannot supply. It is, therefore, that, intrinsically adopting the foundations of the Church of Rome, however disguised and veiled, they justly dread her Rivalship."—Pp. 21, 22.

Mr. Robberds aims at precisely the same object as Mr. Thom, his sermon being entitled, "Popery in all Churches the proper Object of Protestant Antagonism." That the English Presbyterians of Manchester are not alarmed* at the Papal aggression, may be gathered from the almost sportive allusions of their senior pastor:

"We may, perhaps, be more disposed to smile, than to be either indignant or alarmed, at the thought of the Pope's ever bringing this great nation again into spiritual subjection, by any efforts or show that his Cardinal Archbishop and his dozen Bishops may make among us. To a large mass of the people probably they will be no more than his liveried servants, for whom, after a little staring, perhaps, at the peculiarity of their livery (especially at the red hat and red stockings of the Cardinal, if he should venture abroad in his costume), there will soon be no more care or respect than for their triple-crowned Master at Rome." P. 6.

Mr. Crosskey's sermon at Derby contains much sound reasoning and much good feeling. But nothing in his discourse will so much gratify his Roman Catholic friends as his sneer, in p. 14, at "the undue exaltation of reason:"

* This remark may sufficiently contradict the foolish and unfounded observation lately made at a public meeting in London by a clergyman connected with King's College, to the effect that Roman Catholics were gaining many converts from the Unitarians of Lancashire. If Protestantism is understood and valued in any church, it is in that of the English Presbyterians in the North-west.

"There are those who resolve religion solely into an argument. They look out texts of Scripture, argue from them, come to such and such theological conclusions, and then think they are religious men. This among Unitarians, I am bound to confess, has been a most especial fault. A logical absurdity detected to them has sometimes been as religious an act as the relief of a suffering brother. The critical intellect has been their weapon and their god; they have fought with it and worshiped it."

That Unitarians argue more than other religious bodies, we greatly question. The great distinction seems to be not in the degree, but the quality. They argue better. The grave charge brought by Mr. Crosskey against his brethren is, we rejoice to believe, without foundation. He objects to "the cold, dry conclusions of logic;" but we are "bound to confess" we value them above illogical and not quite charitable intuitions. We have felt it a duty to point out this blemish of an otherwise very able sermon.

Mr. James, in a seasonable and vigorous sermon, addressed to the Portland-Street congregation, London, on "Peter's Confession and Christ's Promise," pleads for the great principles of Protestantism and the simplicity of Christianity, with much success.

Mr. Thomas Hincks entitles his discourse, "A Protest against the present Religious Agitation, and a Plea for the Protestant Principle in its integrity." While Mr. Hincks takes no exception whatever to the new Papal Hierarchy, he recognizes amidst the violence and injustice with which it has been assailed some good features. "It has excited a strong detestation of all priestly domination. It has brought Church pretensions to the test. It will yet have the effect of giving increased importance to the lay element in the Church," &c.

Mr. Maclellan at Canterbury discoursed in an evening lecture on "Popery —What it is, and Where it is." He finds many features in common in the Churches of Rome and England.

Dr. Cromwell's discourse at Newington Green, entitled "Our Duty—the present Posture of Ecclesiastical Affairs in England considered," takes a peculiar view of the question. He has no doubt that the Bishop of Rome "has broken the law of England," and thinks he ought to be restrained from the application to the Bishops of his Church of "English territorial designations." Dr. Cromwell takes occasion to record his dissent from those who consider State Churches, or National Establishments for religious purposes, as mischievous in themselves, &c. He thinks, too, that at this hour the Church of England has less of the spirit of persecution than some sects, and that never was there a national religious establishment so moderate in its tone, so powerless to tyrannize, and so operative for good, as the Church of England. We will candidly confess that, even if we had previously sympathized with Dr. Cromwell's views on these topics, we should not have felt that sympathy increased by recent events. We are disposed to draw a wide distinction between the clergy and laity of the Church. In the former we can see little of that moderation and gentleness which Dr. Cromwell assigns as the attributes of the Church of England. The alienation which recent events have disclosed between the intelligent lay members and the majority of the dignitaries and clergy of the Establishment, justifies the cry, The Church is in danger!

We must not leave unmentioned a plain but timely and judicious sermon on religious liberty, preached at Stand by Mr. Cropper.

Communion Thoughts. By S. G. Bulfinch, Author of Lays of the Gospel. Boston. 18mo. Pp. 204. London—E. T. Whitfield.

A pleasing little volume, breathing the sweetest piety and Christian love. It may be profitably studied by young ministers when preparing for the Lord's-Supper service. The "Meditations in Verse" are scarcely equal to the other portions of the volume.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Anniversary of the Re-opening of the Old Presbyterian Chapel, Nantwich.

On Sunday, December 8, this event was commemorated by two sermons preached by the Rev. Samuel Bache, of Birmingham. The subject of the morning's discourse was the Necessity and True Value of Public Worship. Taking for his text the exclamation of Peter on the Mount of Transfiguration, "Master, it is good for us to be here!" the preacher shewed the benefit and influence of public religious worship both socially and individually; he exemplified its beneficial effects on the social relations of life, and drew a most attractive picture of what society would exhibit, if all really came to worship in the true spirit of Christian brotherhood; he also enforced the great truth that religion must be *personal and individual*, not dependent on external rites, but proceeding entirely from the heart. In this portion of his discourse, the elevation and purity of his sentiments, set off by a distinct and powerful delivery, made a deep impression on a most attentive audience.

In the evening Mr. Bache gave a very clear summary of Unitarian principles, from 1 Cor. viii. 6, "But to us there is but one God," &c. After explaining his text and developing the apostle's reasons for not permitting the Corinthian disciples to join the idolatrous feasts celebrated in their city, he applied the principles of the apostle to modern Unitarians, and shewed the impropriety of their giving countenance to creeds and forms of worship to which their consciences were repugnant. While enforcing Christian sincerity, he did not forget other duties, but proceeded to enforce the necessity of entering upon the work of controversy in the true spirit of Christian charity. He said emphatically "that they were *Christian questions*, and therefore should be treated in a *Christian spirit*." Not the least impressive portion of his discourse related to the injury that had been done to the cause of Christ by forgetfulness of this principle. With admirable clearness Mr. Bache vindicated the great Christian doctrine of one God the Father, and shewed the infinitely purer and loftier conception of the Deity as worshiped by Unitarians as their Heavenly Father, than the far-removed and stern Deity of the orthodox.

On the Monday evening, the congregation and friends, to the number of 250, assembled at a public tea-party. After tea the assembled friends adjourned to the chapel. The chair was taken by Mr. John Barker, who briefly congratulated the meeting on the progress the cause of Unitarian Christianity had made in the town, and expressed his hope that the members of the congregation would shew by their lives and actions that they attended to the exhortations of their minister. A vote of thanks to Mr. Bache for his valuable services on the previous day having been moved,

Mr. Hornblower, in seconding it, took the opportunity of urging his flock to ponder well the important subjects on which Mr. Bache had addressed them. He particularly seconded the grand truth enforced by the preacher the day before, that they must become personally devout,—that their religious duties could not be done vicariously,—that this was one of the great errors of priestcraft,—and, till this idea was removed from men's minds, real vital religion would make but little progress in the heart. He also, in reference to the popular question of Popish aggression, urged upon them the necessity of remembering the great principle of Protestantism, "the right of private judgment in religious matters," and begged them to take warning from the persecuting spirit that pervaded all churches and people that had not respected this right. While, however, they were sincerely desirous that all men might be permitted to worship as they thought best, still they must not forget the duty which devolved upon them when they had discovered Christian truth, to exhibit it to others and offer it to their acceptance, not only by argument and persuasion, but still more by the purity and usefulness of their lives.

Mr. Bache, in a very powerful address, shewed that the spirit of Catholicism is the same now as it ever was, aggressive; that the Catholics were only acting up to their religious convictions in endeavouring to make proselytes of others. He said,—Were I a Catholic, and believed, as they do, that my own faith was the only faith that would lead men to heaven, I would not

rest day or night in my labours to convert them: why then should we feel surprised at them? He dwelt on the inconsistency of Protestant Churches binding men in mental chains, while their first principle asserted the right of every man to freedom. He contrasted with them the fidelity of the Unitarian Church to its Protestantism, and said the great work which devolved upon Unitarians was to lead their fellow-Protestants to recognize and to claim their birthright as reasonable beings. In conclusion, Mr. Bache adverted to the fact, that though for many years he had had the honour of preaching in one of the last chapels in which Dr. Priestley ministered, he had on Sunday preached in the first, and had addressed them from the identical pulpit from which that honoured pioneer and champion of Unitarianism (to whose memory he offered a just and fervent tribute of respect) had nearly a century ago addressed their fathers.

Mr. Philip Barker next addressed the meeting, and expressed his gratification at seeing so large an assemblage. He hoped the proceedings of the evening would meet with as large a measure of acceptance as, and be not less useful than, those of the re-opening of their chapel a year ago. He was happy to be able to state that the progress of Unitarianism in the town during the past twelve months was satisfactory. The increase of the number of frequenters of the chapel exceeded their expectation. The chief obstacle to their further progress was the want of chapel accommodation. There were now applicants for sittings and pews who could not be accommodated. The congregation during the past year had been perfectly united. This he attributed in part to their being happily free from subscription to articles and creeds, which proved a frequent source of discord. After alluding to Lord John Russell's recent letter to the Bishop of Durham, and to his Lordship's zeal for religious liberty, he expressed his wish that it might be gratified by the early removal of compulsory church-rates levied on the goods of conscientious Nonconformists. How little religious liberty was respected even in this Protestant country, was seen in the conduct of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster and the Bishop of London, who would not allow Dissenting places of worship to be built on lands under their control. In referring to the question of Popery, he remarked that those who were present at the interesting lectures in the course of delivery by their minister, would learn what was the spirit evinced by Popery in its palmy days. He begged to remind them that in the reign of Elizabeth and the Stuarts, the Church of England persecuted as violently as the Church of Rome had previously done. He reminded them of the horrid persecution of the Covenanters. Should any effort be made to curtail the religious liberty of the Roman Catholics in England, he earnestly hoped that such an effort would be resisted by Protestant Dissenters of every denomination. They had little reason for upholding the Church of England, which had generally been opposed to liberty of conscience, as was proved by the imprisonment of Dissenters for church-rates, by the Test and Corporation Acts, exclusion of Dissenters from the Universities, by the ecclesiastical courts, and the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. He dwelt on the large infusion of Popery in the Book of Common Prayer, and the still larger portion which lurked in the minds of the clergy. He illustrated his views by reference to the forms for Ordination and Absolution, which were at variance with the simplicity of the gospel, and gave scope to priestcraft. After some remarks on the wealth and worldly ambition of English ecclesiastics, Mr. Barker concluded by saying, that if, reserving for themselves and their clergy a simple competence, they would give up the residue for the education of the people, and would abide consistently in Protestant principles and practices, the slumbers of the Anglican clergy would be unbroken by dreams of Papal aggression.

Mr. Howorth opened his speech with a beautiful tribute to the memory of Mr. Roscoe (the father of Mrs. Hornblower), whom he spoke of as a man whom all England, whom all Europe, delighted to honour. He then proceeded to shew that all creeds and churches had produced true disciples of Jesus, who had manifested to the world that the spirit of Christ could overcome all obstacles. He then drew portraits of Fenelon as a Catholic, Bishop Wilson as an English Prelate, John and Charles Wesley as Methodists, Watts as an Independent, and Channing among ourselves, as instances of the great truth he had advanced, and then closed with a fervent exhortation to his hearers to let the spirit of Christ rule them, both

in their own lives, and in their estimate of and conduct to others.

During the evening the choir sang several hymns in a very creditable manner, and shewed they had greatly profited by the instruction they had received during the past year.

Thus ended a very pleasant and profitable evening. There was but one subject of regret, the unavoidable absence of Mr. Aspland (who preached the opening sermon) and of Dr. Beard.

These meetings in small towns like Nantwich are productive of incalculable good. The working classes are not in the habit of hearing speeches of such high-toned sentiment as our ministers address to them; and as regards this town, they are quite alive to the superior quality of the mental food set before them at such gatherings, to the ordinary fare they have been accustomed to. Our ministers of note would confer a great boon on society if they would at this particular crisis visit distant and smaller churches. The people are inquiring, and will listen to just and true principles if they are set before them.

On the Tuesday evening, Mr. Howorth lectured on his favourite subject, Temperance, to an attentive audience.

Popery in Italy and England.

Sir, Dec. 13, 1850.

I received a Genoese paper to-day from my brother Philip, and have translated a portion of it for you. In a letter from my brother he says,

"There is a decided wish on the part of the people here to get free from the dominion of the priests. Talk of priests confining themselves to spiritual affairs, after the recent circulars of the Archbishop of Turin and Sessari, in which they exhorted the people to resist the civil laws of their country! There is more likelihood of Piedmont becoming Protestant than of England becoming Catholic."

Edw. Taylor.

(From the "Corriere Mercantile" of Genoa.)

"These are strange times. On one hand we see certain of the English people reverting to Catholicism, while in Italy, nay in Rome itself, it turns pale with fear.

"Catholicism was once persecuted in England. In Italy, the Pope, the Bishops and their organs of the press, still claim for Catholicism the right to persecute. In England, Catholic emancipation has abolished religious persecution. In Italy, the whole Catholic priesthood demands in favour of the Church no abatement of intolerance, and the aid of the State to that end. In England, Catholic bishops, priests and believers unite in crying out, 'No Established Church—no union of Church and State!' In Italy, all the Catholic clergy denounce and revile any government that desires to lessen the privileges of the Established Church, and savagely threaten and denounce as a heretic every writer who desires that Catholicism shall no longer be imposed as the religion of the State.

"Alas, poor priests! you are compelled in England to utter those fearful words, 'Liberty of conscience and toleration'—words which in Italy you detest and proscribe."

Owens College.

At length we have an official notification from the trustees for educational purposes under the will of the late Mr. John Owens, that they have appointed a Principal and three Professors; that they are about to make appointments to the other two professorships, and to the teacherships; and that they confidently expect that the College will be opened for the admission of students in February next. The classes proposed, and other particulars as to the course of study, are to be announced in future advertisements. The following are the appointments already made:

Alexander John Scott, Esq., M.A. (late Professor of English Language and Literature at University College, London), to be Principal of the College, and also Professor of Logic, Mental and Moral Philosophy, General Grammar, and English Language and Literature.

Jos. Gouge Greenwood, Esq., B.A., Fellow of University College, London, to be Professor of the Languages and Literature of Greece and Rome, and of Ancient and Modern History.

Archibald Sandeman, Esq., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Cambridge, to be Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.

Thus far the advertisement supplies the information; but some further particulars may be interesting to the public. We stated on Saturday that there remained to be filled the following three chairs:—4. History, and Moral and Political Philosophy; 5. Natural History, including Botany and Geology;

and 6. Chemistry.—But we now learn, from the official advertisement just quoted, that the No. 4 chair of the original scheme is not to exist separately, its duties being divided between two of the Professors already appointed,—History, both Ancient and Modern, being assigned to Professor Greenwood, and Mental and Moral Philosophy to Professor Scott, the Principal. There remain, then, only two professorships to be filled,—those of Natural History (including Botany and Geology) and Chemistry. There are also four teacherships to be filled, viz. three of languages, French, German and Italian, and one of Commercial Book-keeping. Now we do not hear anything of the Italian teachership or that of Commercial Book-keeping; but we believe the other appointments will all be filled up early in January. The trustees have appointed meetings to be held, chiefly for the purpose of making these four appointments, during four days in the same week, viz. Monday, Dec. 30; Thursday, Jan. 2; Friday, Jan. 3; and Saturday, Jan. 4.—It is probable, as we have already stated, that the first appointment made will be to the chair of Chemistry; next, to that of Natural History. Then the teacher of the French language will be appointed, and last the teacher of German.

With respect to the chair of Chemistry, we have heard much on the subject of the small stipend of £150 a-year, as wholly inadequate, unless it is proposed to make a further allowance to this Professor, to enable him to procure the requisite chemical apparatus, and all the chemical substances and appliances, sufficient to furnish a scientific laboratory. It is tolerably certain that if the Professor of Chemistry is to provide at his cost the requisite materials and chemical apparatus, his whole salary would not suffice for the purpose. We state these impressions, which are not those of ourselves, but of gentlemen much better informed on such subjects,—that if the point be of any importance, it may have its due consideration with the trustees.

As to the period at which we may expect the College to be opened for the reception of students, so far as we can form an opinion, from a recent visit to the building, there seems every probability of its being ready, so far as regards the rooms and their furniture, exclusive of books and scientific apparatus, about which as yet we have heard nothing.—*Manchester Guardian.*

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 27, at George's meeting, Exeter, by Rev. Thomas Hincks, Mr. J. Pope to Miss Mary Ford.

Oct. 30, at Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, by Rev. Chas. Wicksteed, B.A., Thos. Hurry Tolme, Esq., to Eliza, daughter of Francis Carbutt, Esq., of Leeds.

Nov. 10, at the Unitarian chapel, Shepton Mallet, by Rev. J. B. Bristowe, Mr. Robert Carew to Miss Emma Jane Cappel, both of Shepton.

Dec. 4, at the Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. Thomas Scoles to Mary, daughter of Mr. Thomas Seacombe, of Little Lever.

Dec. 5, by Rev. D. Griffiths, Unitarian minister, Mr. W. Marshall, of Aberdeen, to Miss Isabella Smith, of the same place.

Dec. 5, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. B. Carpenter, Mr. John George Woodward to Miss Mary Parker, both of Nottingham.

Dec. 5, at the Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. James Brimelaw to Mary Yates, daughter of the late Mr. John Holroyd, of Bolton.

Dec. 16, at the Unitarian chapel, Battle, Sussex, by Rev. E. Parry, Mr. John Hammond, of Crawhurst, to Miss Elizabeth French, of Battle.